WHE[illegible]

[illegible]arish C[illegible]egations

BE [illegible]UE

[illegible]hristian Churches,

[illegible] Capable Consenting Incumbents, be truly [illegible] Pastors, or Bishops over their Flocks.

[illegible] Whether, the old Protestants, Conformists, and Noncon[illegible] or the *Brownists*, were in the right herein. And how [illegible] our present Case is the same.

[illegible] *Richard Baxter*, as an Explication of some Passages in his [illegible] especially, his Treatise of [illegible] misunderstood [illegible] by some; and answering the [illegible] Objections of [illegible] especially a Book called,

[illegible] *Judgment and Reasons against Communicating with the Parish* [illegible], *as by Law required.*

And another called, *A Theological Dialogue.*

[illegible]ATHOLICK COMMUNION once more Defended, upon [illegible] importunity.

By *RICHARD BAXTER.*

LONDON:

[illegible] at the *Bible* and [illegible]

[illegible], near *Mercers Chappel.* 1 6 8 [illegible]

BIBLIOTECA BODLEIANA

Communion with Pariſh Churches vindicated, In Anſwer to a Book entituled, The Judgment of Mr. Baxter, *againſt Communicating,* &c. *Miſtaking my writings.*

A Church is not formally, *quid Phyſicum*, but *quid morale politicum Relativum*, a political Relative being.

II. The ſame name ſignifieth both the *Genus* and *Species*, that are divers by uſe.

III. The ſame is true of the name [*Paſtor.*]

IV. Dioceſan Churches are of three ſorts. 1. Such as have at preſent but one fixed Aſſembly, but deſign to gather more hereafter: Such, Dr. *Hammond* thought they were in Scripture times. 2. Such as have one Dioceſan Governour, or Superintendent over many inferior Churches, and their Paſtors. 3. Such as have one only Biſhop or Paſtor, having no other true Paſtor, Elder, Church-Ruler, or Presbyter of Chriſts Inſtitution under him; but Chappels which have no ſuch Ruler or Paſtor.

V. The firſt ſort of Dioceſans we have now nothing to do with.

The ſecond ſort is controverible, ſome holding it ſinful, ſome lawful, and ſome (and very many) to be of Divine Inſtitution, as Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, not in the extraordinaries, but in the ordinary parts of their Office: Chriſt having made an imparity (or a ſuperiority of ſome over others) they think that to ſay without proof, that he changed that order in one Age, is 1. to charge him with mutability and levity. 2. And to diminiſh from his Law (which hath a Curſe.)

The third ſort of Dioceſans, is either 1. of a Dioceſs (like a great Pariſh with Chappels) ſo ſmall that one Paſtor may poſſibly overſee it. (This is tollerable, when more cannot be had; and when they can, it hurts only the well-being of the Church): Or 2. it is of a Dioceſs ſo great as that one man cannot do what is eſſential to a Paſtor, and ſo it is undone: This nullifieth that Species of Churches which is of Chriſts Inſtitution.

VI. A particular Church of Chriſts Inſtitution of the loweſt political order, is, [*A competent number of Neighbour-Chriſtians, who by Chriſts appointment, and their own expreſt conſent, are aſſociated with one or more Paſ-*

for the right worshipping of God in publick, and the Edification of the Members, by *the exercise of the said Pastoral Office, and their mutual Duties to God, to their Pastors, and each others, for the welfare of the Society, and the pleasing and glorifying of God.*]

VII. The Pastoral Office as over this first or lowest Church, and as it is in unfixed Ministers, related yet to no one Church more than another, differeth but as the subject matter (or object) of their charge doth differ, and not in the fundamental Power or Order.

VIII. This Pastoral Office is essentially Ministerial to Christ as the Prophet, Priest, and King of his Church. 1. A Power to Teach. 2. To Lead in Worship. 3. To Guide by the Keys of Reception, Admonition, Exclusion and Restoration.

IX. It is not *Inconsistent* with this *Pastoral Office* to be *Governed* by *Superiors*, whether Magistrates, or Ecclesiasticks (as others were by Apostles, and by *Timothy*, *Titus*, &c.) Therefore every limitation, restraint, rebuke, or punishment, for Mal-administration, nullifieth not the Office, nor yet allowing an appeal to Superiors.

X. To hinder a *Pastor* from *forcible excluding* men from Church or Sacrament, and allow him only to do it by *Application of Gods word*, is agreeable to his Office.

XI. It is *Power* and *Obligation to exercise*, and not the present *actual Exercise*, that is essential to the Office in the fundamental Relation: But should the Non-exercise be total and stated, it would not make up a Church in act; No more than a mere Power to Teach, will make a School in act.

XII. He that *hath* the entire *Power*, and *statedly exerciseth* but *one part* of it, statedly omitting an *essential part*, may be in *Order* an *empowred* Minister; but his Society is but a *half Church*: But if it be only an *Integral part* that he omits, it may be a true Church, tho faulty; or if it be an *essential part*, and not *statedly*, but only by some present impedition.

XIII. The name of *Church Pastor* and *Dioceſan*, being formally Relative in signification, are really divers things, as the *Fundamentum*, *Relatum*, *Correlatum*, and *Terminus*, are divers. They are therefore considerable. *I.* As constituted and described by Christ. *II.* As understood, described and confined to by sound Orthodox Pastors and People. *III.* As described by Laws and Canons. *IV.* As esteemed and described by many mistaking Bishops, Clergy and People, some Super-Conformists, and some Misjudging, that the Law saith as they: The word as to these senses is equivocal.

XIV. *Christs Institution* went before *mens Corruption*; and is to be held to by all Christians, who own him to be the Maker and Ruler of his own Church: And no man hath Power to null his Institution, nor to warrant us to make his Church another thing.

XV. By Christs Institution every Ministerial Elder and Pastor hath *Power.* 1. To *Teach* the People. 2. To Lead them in *Worship.* 3. To *Receive* by Baptism, and to *Communion*, or to refuse on just cause (tho under Government) as aforesaid: (The whole Office I have copiously described in my *Universal Concord*, 24. years ago.)

XVI. The Parishes that have capable Christians and Ministers consented to by their submission, are such true Churches; their *Neighbourhood and Christianity* making them capable matter. Not that a man is *of the Church*, because he is in *the Parish* (Atheists, Infidels, Sadduces, Hereticks and Refusers, may dwell there, (Its thought that of 60000. that dwell in one *London* Parish, 10000 Communicate not, and so 40000 or 50000, are not of that Church) but those that are capable Consenters, and Communicants.

XVII. This sort of Churches we were in Possession of 1660, and till *August* 24. 1662. And of 9000 Ministers, then 2000 only were put out, the other 7000 continuing in. And of those that were put out, some few gathered part of their old Flock into private Churches, renouncing, and dissuading them from the publick: Most gathered no such Churches, but help their old People as they could, not drawing them from the Parish Churches, till the time of the Kings Licences for more open Ministry. Many led them to the Parish Churches, and took themselves for fellow Pastors, with the publick Ministers, and lived in Love and Communion with them. The People were not by the new Law cast out with the Ministers. Most of the people in the 2000 Parishes of the ejected, and almost all in the other 7000, who before communicated, or were capable of it, continuing the Parish Communion. And so are Churches, if they were so before.

XVIII. The generality of the former Protestant Bishops, and Clergy, took the Parish Rectors to be true Pastors of the Parish Churches, as Bishop *Usher* proved them: The Church of *England* is confessed to be of this mind, before the Wars. It is not certain that Arch-Bishop *Laud* thought otherwise: If he did, *Heylin* names but five that joyned with him in his main cause, of whom *Mountague*, if not more, were for the contrary cause in this point.

XIX. They then took a *Curate* to be a *Pastor*, and to have all that is essential to the Presbyters Office; And to be a Presbyter and no Pastor, is a Contradiction in the sense of Protestants and Papists, except what is said for Lay-Elders. In *France* they call all their Parish-Pastors, Curates; the word signifieth the *Curam animarum.*

XX. No Law since 1660. hath changed any essentials of the Parish-Pastors Office (and so none hath nulled it) from what it was in 1640. They that affirm the contrary, must prove it.

The Law before, subjected Parish-Pastors to Diocesans: It imposed the Oath of Canonical Obedience, and a promise of the same in Ordination;

It

It was the ſame to the Eccleſiaſtical Courts as now. If any pretend to ſuch ſingular skill in Law, as to ſay that there was no Law for the Book of Ordination, which made the ordained to Covenant to obey their Ordinaries, nor any Law for the Canons, I hope he will have more reaſon than to lay the controverſie about Separation on his odd conceit, when all the People in *England* have in the days of the four laſt Soveraigns, been forced to ſubmit to theſe as Legal; and no ſuch pretender could at any time deliver them. Books have been written, and Pleas uſed againſt ſubmitting to the Courts that declared not that they held their Authority from the King; but the Judges ſtill over-ruled it againſt them. And they that profeſt to hold it from the King, did many, if not moſt, mean but the Liberty of publick exerciſing it, as the Miniſtry is held under him, or the adjunct Cogent Power, or the *Circa ſacra*.

XXI. The Law enableth the Pariſh-Miniſter to receive into the Church by Baptiſm, (tho under canonical Preſcripts, which Diſſenters much diſlike), and to Catechize Youth, and certifie their fitneſs for Confirmation, before they Communicate: It bindeth them to reject all from Communion, who are not confirmed, or at leaſt are not ready and deſirous of it; it tells us who is to be taken for ready, Thoſe that have learnt the Catechiſm, and ſolemnly own their Baptiſmal Covenant. The Paſtor hereby hath Power to try all the unconfirmed, whether they are thus ready or not. The Canon requireth him to deny Communion to all that live in any ſcandalous Sin: The Law and Canon bid him to inſtruct the Congregation, to lead them in publick Worſhip, and in the Name of Chriſt to Reprove, Admoniſh, Comfort, Adminiſter the Lord Supper, Viſit the Sick with Inſtruction and Prayers. All which, with the aforeſaid Power of judging who ſhall be Communicants, is full as much as is Eſſential to a Pariſh-Paſtor. Solemnly to pronounce them Excommunicate, beſide refuſing Communion, is not Eſſential. If it were, they have Power to do it, after the Biſhops Sentence. If it were Eſſential to do it as ungoverned, or finally, or without appeal, then Apoſtolick, yea and Magiſtrares Government would null the Paſtors Office.

XXII. The altering ſome words in Ordination, and putting out the name [*Paſtors*] from moſt places in the Litturgy, where they were applied to Pariſh-Miniſters, is no change at all of the Office, much leſs of its eſſence. It takes no Power from them, which they had: But it was done by the intereſt of ſome men, who thought that Presbyters, who ſwore the three Kingdoms againſt Biſhops, had taken too much upon them, and in oppoſition they endeavoured to keep them under, and ſo would diminiſh their pretences for Parity. But this changeth not the Species of the Office. And its known who theſe men were: And tho ſome of them are of Opinion, that Dioceſan Biſhops only may regularly confer Ordination, and exerciſe Juriſdiction over the Clergy, and that meer Presbyter Ordination with us

is

is null. 1. Theſe ſame men had a chief hand in debating and wording the Kings Declarations *October*, 1661. Concerning Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, and therein the King after debates with Lords and Biſhops, diſtinguiſheth the meer Paſtoral preſwaſive Power, from the Epiſcopal (which is Cogent) and alloweth the Rural Deans with the Presbyters of his Deanry, to exerciſe the ſaid *Paſtoral perſwaſive Power*, and the other Paſtors alſo to joyn with the Biſhops. And the Law ſtill calls them Rectors: The Liturgy yet calls them Paſtors; the word *Paſtors*, being a Metaphor, they take to be general, *Biſhops and Prieſts* being with them two Orders of Paſtors. Therefore becauſe it doth not diſtinguiſh them, they uſually leave it out, and put ſometime Biſhops and Curates, and ſometime Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons: The common deſcription of a Biſhop by them, is, that he hath the ſole Power of preſiding and determining in Ordination, and Juriſdiction, *ſine quo non*, oft alledging Jeroms, *Quid facit Epiſcopus, quod non facit Presbyter excepta Ordinatione.* And yet the Law ſtill binds them, not to ordain without Presbyters Impoſition of hands with them. And Arch-Deacons and Presbyters, Surrogates, *&c.* Excommunicate. And in the Ember-week, they are every day to pray by the Liturgy. [*So guide and govern the minds of thy Servants, the Biſhops and Paſtors of thy Flock, that they may lay hands ſuddenly on no man.*] Where Biſhops and Paſtors cannot be taken for Synonyma, whilſt they ſpeak of all that lay on hands. And they diſtinguiſh not [*Paſtors and Curates*] where they change the words, but [*Biſhops and Curates.*]

But nothing more proveth what I ſay, than that the Law yet bindeth all Prieſts to all that is eſſential to an *Epiſcopus Gregis*, a Paſtor of a particular Church; ſee the Exhort. in Ord. of Prieſts, [*We exhort you in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that you have in remembrance, into how high a dignity, and to how weighty an office and charge ye are called*; *that is to ſay, to be Meſſengers, Watchmen, and Stewards of the Lord, to teach and to premoniſh, to feed and provide for the Lords Family, to ſeek for Chriſts Sheep, that are diſperſed abroad, and for his Children, who are in the midſt of this naughty world, that they may be ſaved by Chriſt for ever*; *have always therefore printed in your remembrance, how great a treaſure is committed to your charge, for they are the ſheep of Chriſt, which he bought*, &c. *The Church and Congregation whom you muſt ſerve is his Spouſe and his Body*; *and if it ſhall happen, the ſame Church, or any member thereof to take any hurt or hindrance by reaſon of your negligence, ye know the greatneſs of the fault, and the horrible puniſhment that will enſue: Wherefore conſider with your ſelves the end of your miniſtry towards the children of God, towards the Spouſe and body of Chriſt, and ſee that* you never ceaſe *your labour, your care and diligence, till you have done all that lieth in you according to your bounden duty, to bring all ſuch as are or ſhall be committed to your charge, to that agreement in the faith and knowledg of God, and that ripeneſs and perfectneſs of age in Chriſt, that there be no place left among you, either for error in Religion, or vicious-*

vicioufneſs of life: Foraſmuch then as your office is both of ſo great excellency, and of ſo great difficulty, ye ſee with how great care and ſtudy ye ought to apply your ſelves, as well that ye may ſhew your ſelves dutiful and thankful to the Lord, who hath placed you in ſo high a dignity, as alſo to beware that neither you your ſelves offend, nor be occaſions that others offend.

And after their Covenant to preach according to the Scripture, they promiſe [to give faithful diligence, *to* adminiſter *the* Doctrine, Sacraments, *and* Diſcipline of Chriſt *as the* Lord hath commanded, *and as this* Church *and* Realm hath received the ſame, according to the Commandments of God: *So that you* may teach *the* people committed *to your* care and charge with all diligence to keep and obſerve the ſame.

Here Doctrine, Sacraments, and Diſcipline, are their Office-works: Gods Commandments are their Rule, tho on ſuppoſition that this Realm hath received them according to his Commandments.

Next they covenant with all faithful diligence to baniſh all erroneous and ſtrange doctrines contrary to Gods word, and to uſe both PUBLICK and PRIVATE Monitions and Exhortations, as well to the ſick as to the whole, within your cures, as need ſhall require, and occaſion ſhall be given: And [*to keep* quietneſs, Peace *and* Love *among all Chriſtian people, and eſpecially among them that are or ſhall be committed to their charge.*

All this is ſetled by Law, and all Miniſters ſubſcribe to it: And is not this enough to the eſſence of a Paſtors office? What is the Reaſon? The next promiſe is [Reverently *to* obey their Ordinary, *and* other chief Miniſters, *to* whom *is* commited *the* charge *and* government of them, *following with a glad mind and will, their godly admonitions, and* ſubmitting themſelves to their godly judgments.

This ſhews that, 1. It is not a ſtrict Divine Right that is meant over them; for *all Ordinaries*, and other *chief Miniſters*, pretend not to ſuch right. 2. If others ſuperiority null their office, then none is in office but the King: Was *Diotrephes* no Miniſter, becauſe *John* threatned him as his ſuperior? It's liker he had been none for reſiſting *John*, of the two: Were all degraded that obeyed the Apoſtles? If it ſhould be an error, that a Parochial Biſhop is a Governor over his junior-Presbyters, or a Dioceſan over both; that nulleth not the Presbyters office: The Presbyterians give a *Claſſis* or *Synod* as much power over particular Churches, as the Epiſcopal give to *Dioceſans*; (or near): And yet few Separatiſts have thence concluded that they have no particular Churches, or that this nulleth them; contrarily, *ab eſt tertii adjecti ad eſt ſecundi valet argumentum*; Pariſh Churches are govern'd Churches ſubject to ſuperiors; *ergo*, they are Churches.

And the Law calls them *Churches*, *ergo*, it taketh them for Churches, (while it taketh no eſſential from them).

XXIII. There are ſome particular Drs. in *England* indeed, who ſay that *Toure is no Church without a Biſhop of its own*, and *ubi Epiſcopus, ibi Eccleſia*, and that *Eccleſia eſt plebs Epiſcopo adunata*, and that our Pariſh Miniſters are

no

no Bishops, and that their sole Ordinations are nullities; and consequently it would follow, that their Parish Churches are truly but parts of a Church *infimæ speciei*: And because these men speak against *Reordination*, and yet require those to be ordained again, who were here ordained by mere Presbyters, therefore it seemeth plain, that they take the former for no true Ordination: These men I have oft confuted, especially in my Treatise of Episcopacy: And hence some gather, that I charge this error on all the Church of *England*, and take the Law and Clergy to nullifie the Parish-Ministry and Churches: Therefore I am specially obliged to answer such misconcluders, lest they make my writings a means of deceit against my sence, and against my will: for so unhappy is the controversal world, even of men of Worth and Name, that if I do but say that *two* is *less* than *three*, and that *four* is *more* than *three*, they fear not to say, that I contradict my self, and *R.* is against *B.* and sometimes I speak for, and sometimes against the same cause, and these being ordinary Disputers and Church-guides, What hope have the Christian Flocks of Unity and Peace, but by such mens ceasing their disputes?

Here therefore it must be noted, 1. That the men of this opinion are not to be called, The Church of *England*. The most of the Bishops and Clergy formerly were against them, Dr. *Hammond*, and Bishop *Gunning*, and a few more, were almost the first that seemed to go so far. 2. And yet even these few do usually except the case of necessity, and of the forreign churches, (as Dr. *Sherlock* hath lately done at large) so that then they cannot take their Episcopal ordination received, to be essential to the Priesthood. 3. And these men themselves call our Parish societies, *Parish Churches*, and deny not the Presbyters to be *Episcopi Gregis*, and to have a pastoral care of the peoples souls, for they own the Liturgy, Ordination, and other writings of the Church, which assert it. 4. Their opposition to Presbytery hath carried them to appropriate the name *Bishop* to the Diocesans, but by it they mean only a *Bishop over Presbyters, having the power to ordain and depose them, and to be cheif in governing all the flocks*; But the controversie *de nomine*, and *de re* are not the same: This denieth not all Pastoral Episcopacy in Presbyters over the flocks under them: That these men by running into extreams do ill, many have written to prove: But *maiming* the Parish Ministry, or *too much limiting* it, is not *nullifying* it. 5. Let it be considered, that even the Separatists say not that the *Power of Ordination* is essential to *Pastors*: Some of them take Pastors *unordained*, only *elected* and *received* with prayer: Some take men ordained by *neighbour Pastors*, that have no power over them: Some take men ordained by Bishops, some by Magistrates: And *Jurisdiction* over *neighbour Pastors* I am sure the Separatists will say belongs neither to the being or well being of a Pastor. If then it be the *Power of Ordaining*, and of Jurisdiction over other Pastors, which the Diocesans deny the Parish Pastors, the deny them nothing hereby essential to their office.

All

All that can with any colour be ſaid, is, that the *Law* now ſeems to be on theſe mens ſide, by *requiring Reordination*. But, 1. The Law-makers profeſs to *eſtabliſh* the Church, and not to *change* it to another thing. 2. The Law-makers were not all of one mind in the Reaſons of their Laws; nor had all ſtudied theſe kind of controverſies: Many of them, and of the Clergy to this day, ſay that it is not a proper ordination that they require, but the giving them Anthority to exerciſe their Miniſtry in *England*, and the deciſion of a doubtful caſe: Part of the Church taketh them for true Miniſters that were ordained by Presbyters, and part do not; and that the Congregations may not divide, they ſay they require this like Baptizing after a doubtful Baptiſm [*If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee.*] I am againſt this: But this proveth not that they take a *Presbyter* for no *Paſtor*: Yea tho they ſhould take his ordaining others to be a nullity; *Ordaining* not being *eſſential* to him.

XXIV. The Act of Uniformity, or the like Law, cannot make the Church no Church, or of another ſpecies, than 1. As it is *eſteemed by God* and *his Law*. 2. Or as it is *eſteemed by the greater part of the Chriſtian Clergy* and Laity: Tho the Law ſhould ſpeak as the forefaid odd innovators do. For,

1. All Chriſtians profeſs that Chriſt is the only juſt Inſtitutor of the eſſentials of his own Churches: All Chriſtians profeſs Communion with them as Churches of Chriſts making by his Law: The preſent Church of *England* profeſſeth this in many books; it bindeth all Miniſters to hold to Scripture ſufficiency, and uſe Diſcipline as well as Doctrine and Worſhip, as Chriſt commandeth: It openly holdeth all Laws and Canons about Church eſſentials, yea and integrals, to be void and null that are againſt the Sacred Scriptures, and Law of God: There is no Power but of God: God hath given no power to nullifie his inſtitutions.

2. All true Chriſtians who conſent to a Pariſh Miniſter, and attend on his Miniſtry, and join in the Aſſemblies, openly profeſs to own him firſt as a Miniſter of Chriſt, and to join in Worſhip and Communion of the church as preſcibed by Chriſt, which no man hath power to overthrow.

3. The Parliament and Convocations, and Biſhops and Clergy, all confeſs that they have no power to overthrow the Church eſſentials or offices of Chriſts Inſtitution: They have not revoked the Church Writings in which all this is oft profeſſed: They confeſs that if their Laws miſtake and do contrary, they bind us not: They never openly profeſſed a war againſt God or Jeſus Chriſt: What if one Dr. *S. Parker*, make *Chriſt ſubject to the King in his Kingdom*; *he* is not the *Kingdom*, nor the *Church* of *England*: For all his words they never made any Law to command Chriſt, or to puniſh him: They never cited him to appear before them, nor did any penal execution on his Perſon, which Government implieth. They bowat his name, and profeſs ſubjection to him.

Therefore if the law had by error ſaid any thing inconſiſtent with the eſſence of Churches and Miniſtry, it had not been obligatory to Paſtors or people, but they ought ſtill to take Churches and Paſtors to be what Chriſt hath made them, and deſcribed them to be.

XXV. Suppoſe a Law ſhould ſay, *All families ſhall be ſo under Dioceſans as to have no power but from them, and all ſhall ſubſcribe to this.* This doth not null family-power and ſociety as inſtituted by God, nor make it a ſin to live in Families, nor diſſolve them all; But all muſt continue in Families as inſtituted by God: And if any *ſubſcribe* to this, it will not make it a ſin in all Wives, Children and Servants to live in thoſe families.

If the Law had ſaid, *All Schools in* England *ſhall be eſſentially ſubject to Dioceſans*, muſt we therefore have had no more Schools? Or if the Schoolmaſter ſubſcribe to them, is it a ſin to be his Scholar?

If the Law ſhould ſay, *All Chriſtians ſhall chooſe their own Paſtors, and meet and pray and preach as they pleaſe, but only in eſſential ſubjection to Dioceſans*, muſt all therefore give over Church Communion?

If the Law had ſaid, *All the Pariſh-Aſſemblies in* England *ſhall henceforth be eſſentially ſubject to the Pope, or a forreign Council*, We muſt not therefore have forborn all ſuch *Aſſembling*, but have kept to the ſtate and duty appointed us by Chriſt.

XXVI. Here the miſtaking Opponents ſay, 1. That indeed *de jure* none can change the Eſſence of Chriſts Miniſtry and Churches, but *de facto* they may, and have done.

Anſ. What is meant by [changing it, *de facto*?] Have they *de facto*, nulled Chriſts Power, Law, or Offices and Churches? What? Nulled it by a Nullity of pretended Authority, and overcome his Power without Power? *De jure*, and *de facto*, to be a true Church or Paſtor, is all one. Chriſt made true ones: *De facto* they cannot unmake them, but by deſtroying *matter or form*, becauſe they cannot do it *de jure*: They have deſtroyed neither *matter* or *form* of ſuch pariſh churches as I plead for, and which Chriſt inſtituted; for they had not power to do it: Indeed they may *de facto* make other ſort of *Churches* and *Miniſters* to *themſelves*, (tho not *de jure*) but *not to us*, who ſtick to Chriſts inſtitutions.

XXVII. But ſay they, *We confeſs, if the Law did bid all aſſemblies in* England *meet in dependance on Dioceſans, private and publick; this would not alter the ſpecies of our ſeparate Churches, becauſe man hath not power, and we conſent not.*

Anſ. Very good. And I pray you what alters the caſe, as to the Pariſh-Churches? Is it that they have Steeples and Bells, or that they have Tythes? It's the Calamity of Diſſenters, that they either cannot conſider, or can feel no ſtrength in the plaineſt truth that is ſaid againſt them; but thoughts and ſenſe run all one way, which they think right.

XXVIII. Obj. *But ſay they, Conſtitutive and Declaritive Laws muſt be diſtinguiſhed. They can but declare our Meetings to be Dioceſan, which is falſe; but they conſtitute the Pariſh-Meetings ſuch.*

Anſ. 1. Remember that *declaring* the Pariſh-Churches to be ſuch, doth no more *conſtitute them* ſuch, than *yours*: Why then talk you ſo much of the words of Biſhops, and Clergy, and Books, as if their *declarations* made them ſuch? 2. But how doth a Law conſtitute one (the Parochial) to be Dioceſan, (or null), more than your ſeparate meetings, if by a Law of toleration it ſhould ſay the ſame of them? The truth is, They are *ſuch to conſenters that judg them ſuch*: But they conſtitute them not ſuch to any that conſent not to ſuch a conſtitution, but hold to Chriſts.

XXIX. But it is ſaid, that *our thoughts alter not conſtitutions, they are our own immanent acts, that* nihil ponunt in eſſe; *and therefore the Paſtors and Churches will be what Law maketh them, whatever we think.*

Anſ. Are not Churches *formally relative ſocieties*; what maketh them ſuch, but *thoughts* and *wills* of *men expreſſed*? Gods mind expreſt in his Inſtitutions is *his premiſed conſent*; our conſequent obedient *conſent* maketh *Chriſtians, Paſtors*, and *Churches*: If a Law cannot make the Pariſh *conſent* to null Chriſts Officers and Churches, it doth not null them to them. If a Law ſay, *All marriages ſhall be void unleſs the Biſhop remarry them*: This maketh them not void to any that conſent not, but ſay, we ſtand to the valid marriage we had. What doth another mans *conſent* do to conſtitute me a *Chriſtian* or *Church-member* (except Parents for Infants)? And if *my thoughts* and *conſent* put nothng *in eſſe*, then the *thoughts* and *conſents* of the conforming Clergy alters not their Churches; and what then is that *conſtituting cauſe* you talk of? Is it only the law? for ſhame ſay not ſo; *Gods own Law* as commanding us to be Chriſtians, Paſtors or Churches, *maketh* us *not* ſuch, without *conſent*: And can mans Law both null Gods Law, and make us of what ſpecies it doth but bid us be, without our conſent?

XXX. But here our Diſputants think they expoſe me to deriſion: *What? Do I intimate that one and the ſame Congregation, may be two Churches of different ſpecies?*

Anſ. I think to be ſuch by open profeſſion, is diſorderly and unuſual: But I think he that denieth this, is unfit to deride the ignorance of another.

1. If the people in one Kingdom may be, *in ſpecie*, two Kingdoms, the people of one Aſſembly may be two Churches; but Biſhop *Bedle* in his printed Letter ſaid, that *Ireland* was then two Kingdoms, the King being Sovereign to ſome, and the Pope to other: And I think *Hungary* is ſo now, between the Emperor and *Turks*.

2. When *Paul* ordinarily held his aſſemblies in the Jewiſh Synagogues, where half were Infidels, and half Chriſtians, (before he ſeparated his Chriſtians from them) I think they were two Churches.

3. If Independents had leave to meet in the Pariſh churches, where the Pariſh Miniſter, and their own Miniſter ſhould preach by turns, and the Pariſh only heard theirs as a *lay preacher*, or none of their Paſtor, and ſo they heard the Pariſh Preachers, I doubt not, but they would be diſtinct church-

If one Pariſh church have two Paſtors, and one of them be profeſſedly for an eſſential ſubjection to the Pope, and the other againſt it, and half the people of one mind, and half of the other, I think they are two Churches in one place.

If thoſe Anabaptiſts who take none but the re-baptized for Church-members, ſhould with their Paſtors join with Independents in worſhip, tho eſteeming them no churches, I ſuppoſe you think they would be diſtinct churches in one place.

But I think none of this is the caſe of the churches that I join with; for I ſuppoſe they null not Chriſts *ſpecies* of Miniſters to themſelves or me. But if they did it to themſelves, that would not do it to me.

XXXI. Obj. *But one and the ſame Miniſter cannot be of two ſpecies, and therefore relation to him cannot conſtitute diſtinct Churches.*

Anſ. 1. One and the ſame man cannot be a Miniſter of Chriſt, and no Miniſter of Chriſt; ſo much is true, nor of any two *inconſiſtent ſpecies*: But if you will call any circumſtantial difference a diſtinct *ſpecies*, that will not hinder the conſiſtence: The ſame man may be Chriſts *Miniſter*, and the *Kings Chaplain*, or a *Dean*, or *Prebendary*, or a *Dioceſan* Biſhop, or Subject to a Dioceſan, ſuch Biſhops as *Chryſoſtom*, *Auguſtine*, *Ambroſe*, *Jewel*, *Parker*, *Grindal*, *Uſher*, *Davenant*, &c and their Chaplains did not ceaſe to be Chriſts Miniſters.

2. Relation to one of theſe men may make two ſorts of conſiſtent churches, if the ſame man have a Pariſh and a Dioceſs, as the German ſuperintendents have, and many other Biſhops; the warrantableneſs we are not now diſputing.

3. Yea, one and the ſame Pariſh Miniſter may be Paſtor of two Churches in one Aſſembly: If he openly profeſs himſelf Orthodox, the people that ſo own him are a church; and if he ſecretly to a party of them profeſs himſelf an Anabaptiſt, or a Papiſt, and they unite with him as ſuch, they are another church, ſuch as it is; *Veſpæ habent favos, & marcionitæ eccleſias*: Tertul.

XXXII. Obj. But the grand Objection is, *No man can be a Paſtor of Chriſt againſt his will: The Pariſh Miniſters have all by conforming, renounced the eſſence of the Chriſtian Miniſtry, and ſubſcribed and ſworn this renunciation by ſubjecting themſelves to Dioceſans, and ſwearing never to endeavour any alteration of the Dioceſan Government, and the Veſtries who repreſent the churches, have ſworn the ſame; and you have often ſaid that the Dioceſan form of Government, 1. Depoſeth the Pariſh Biſhops, and maimeth the Miniſtry. 2. Diſpoſeth the Pariſh Churches. 3. And maketh Pariſh Diſcipline impoſſible.*

Anſ. It is impoſſible to write that, which no man can miſunderſtand, and make an ill uſe of. I have oft told you,

1. That I am in doubt, whether Arch-Biſhops as Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, only in the ordinary continued part of their Office, be *jure divino*, or not.

2. That

2. That *Congrational* Biſhops over Presbyters, being *ejuſdem ordinis*, are an old venerable and lawful humane Inſtitution.

3. That *Congregational Biſhops, only over the Laity*, are all Presbyters as ſuch, and of Chriſts Inſtitution.

4. Hereupon I have oft diſtinguiſhed Dioceſans into two ſorts. 1. Thoſe that are but the *Governors of true particular Churches, that depoſe them not*, but *Rule them* by the word perſwaſively: Theſe are called Biſhops, being really Arch-Biſhops: Theſe I never charged of the Conſequents forenamed: And if the King make them *Cogent Magiſtrates* alſo, I will obey them. I take the judgment of the Church of *England* manifeſt in Ordination, Liturgy, Articles, *&c.* to be for ſuch Dioceſans only, tho I vaſtly diſſent from many things in the Canons by which, and the Mode in which ſome exerciſe their Government.

2. The other ſort is the Innovators form of Dioceſan Government, which hold that there is no Church without a Biſhop, and no Biſhop but Dioceſans, (either Biſhop of Laity or Presbyters) and ſo that the Pariſh-Churches are no Churches, but part of the loweſt ſort of true Political Churches: Theſe I take to be *Super-conformiſts*, yea *Nonconformiſts*, and Diſſenters from the Church of *England*, tho they may ſtrive to get the name of the Church to themſelves. Now, what I ſay of *theſe Innovating Nonconformiſts*, and their deſigns and attempts, our miſtaking Separatiſts ſay, I ſpeak of the *Legal Church* frame, and ſo of all the Biſhops and *Pariſh-Churches*. And I ſee no hope of delivering the Church of God from the trouble of incogitant confident erroneous Diſſenters, that are not able to diſtinguiſh.

XXXIII. I further anſwer this great Objection (being concerned in Conſcience to do it, when men father their miſtakes and Separation on me.) 1. The Pariſh-Miniſters that I joyn with, (and I think the moſt that ever I knew) have not (that I know of) renounced any thing eſſential to a Pariſh-Paſtor: I before ſaid, *Ordination* and *Juriſdiction* over Presbyters or other Churches, is no part of its eſſence. To be obedient to a Dioceſan, is no ſuch Renunciation. Therefore it is no ſuch Renunciation to promiſe to obey them in lawful things, ſubordinate to obeying Chriſt. If it prove a *miſtake* in them, and that they owe no ſuch Obedience, every ſuch miſtake doth not degrade them. He that ſaid, that (*he that will be greateſt, ſhall be ſervant of all*) thought not that to *obey an equal*, did *null* the Miniſtry. Nor he that ſaid, *Be ſubject one to another.* Chriſt and *Peter paid tribute to avoid offence, tho the Children be free.*

But what if a man be *in doubt*, whether ſuch Obedience be not his *Duty*: Is it not the ſafer ſide much more if he verily think it his Duty?

2. To take Dioceſans to be *Jure Divino*, is ſaid by ſome to be *deſtructive* of the *Paſtoral Office*, and Churches, and a change of the *Engliſh* Church-Government. But it's error. For 1. It is not the *Deſtructive Dioceſan Government*, which acknowledg no Church and Paſtor under them, that thoſe in queſtion conſent

conſent to; but the *Governing Dioceſan*, who ruleth ſubject Paſtors and Churches.

2. This Queſtion of *Divine* right, is threefold. 1. Of that which by *Divine right* is *neceſſary*, ad eſſe. 2. Of that which is by Divine right, *beſt and moſt elegible*, or needful, *ad melius eſſe*. 3. That which is by right of Divine Conceſſion *lawful*, but not neceſſary. The Church of *England* never determined, which of theſe was the Dioceſans Caſe: *All* Conformiſts judged it *Lawful*; multitudes judged it *Better* than other forms: Many judged it *neceſſary* when it might be had. But no Law determined for any of theſe alone. Unleſs you will ſay, the Preface to the Book of Ordination doth it, by ſaying [*It is evident to all men diligently reading holy Scripture, and Ancient Authors, that from the Apoſtles time, there have been* theſe Orders *of Miniſters in Chriſts Church, Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in ſuch Reverend Eſtimation*, &c.]

Here ſome ſay, That the Church of *England* took not theſe for three diſtinct Orders before 1640, but now: Therefore by the word [*theſe Orders*] is meant only *two*.

Anſ. At this rate, he muſt have the better, whom the hearer beſt truſteth, whatever he ſay: If [*theſe Orders* of *Miniſters*, *Biſhops*, *Prieſts*, and *Deacons*,] ſpeak not *three Orders*, I cannot underſtand them. Here note partiality; the ſame that refuſe to ſubſcribe them, becauſe they ſpeak *three Orders*; yet ſay, they ſpeak but two] when they argue that Church-Government is changed 1662, from what it was 1640.

Indeed *Ælfricks* Laws in *Spelman*, make Biſhops and Prieſts the ſame Order, and ſo do a great part of Schoolmen and other Papiſts; but the *Engliſh* Biſhops and Clergy were ſome of one mind, and ſome of another about it, and determined it not. Unleſs this Preface be a Determination, the Name [*Order* and *Office*] being both uſed.

And (to inſtance in no other) *Saravia* (tho no *Engliſh* man, yet of the Church of *England*) wrote more ſtrongly almoſt than any that I ever read, for Dioceſan Epiſcopacy (againſt *Beza*, &c.) and that upon this ground of *Divine right*, that they *ſucceeded the Apoſtles*, and ſuch as *Timothy*, *Titus*, &c. in the Government of many Churches. (And the Kings Divines at the Iſle of *White* went all on that Ground).

To ſay then, that to plead a *Divine right* for them, is *new*, is to contradict large Hiſtorical Evidences. And were it true, that this had been never before Impoſed or Subſcribed; ſurely it is not an Opinion of the Divine right of *governing* of many Churches, that renounceth the *being* of thoſe Churches; it *aſſerteth them* to be by *Divine right*. For that which is *not*, is not *governable*. *Non entis, non ſunt accidentia.*

But where and how hath the Law or Church altered the caſe ſince 1640. Theſe words were in the Book of Ordination before, and I know of none plainer that way ſince. Its *deſtructive Dioceſan* Government, which

renounceth

renounceth the Government of any ſubject Churches, but of one only, and of any Paſtors that I argue againſt, and not *Governours* of ſuch Churches.

XXXIV. But it's objected, *That they ſwear* [*not to endeavour any alteration of Church-Government; therefore they renounce the Paſtoral Office, becauſe the preſent Government excludeth it.*

Anſ. 1. This is to dictate, and not to prove: The Dioceſan Government *hampered* and *fettered* it by the Canons in the time of *Whitgift* and *Bancroft*, but null'd it not: He that reads the Canons, or knows the Church, and thinks that it's Government hath no need of *Amendment*, is far from my mind: But *governing* is not *nullifying*.

2. It is not true (that ever I heard) that they *ſwear* what this Objection ſaith: The Miniſters do not *ſwear*, but *ſubſcribe* it, and *ſwear Obedience* in *licitis & honeſtis:* (And I could never learn what Law commands that Oath). And if it ſhould extend to obey all the *Canons*, it's that which I would be full loath to ſwear; but I know no Canon that utterly nulleth the Pariſh-Churches and Miniſters. And a *Juſtice* that ſweareth *to execute the Laws*, is not ſuppoſed thereby to juſtifie every Law, nor to execute any, if it ſhould be againſt Gods Law, that exception being ſtill ſuppoſed.

3. Their Subſcription *never to endeavour alteration*, engageth them never to endeavour to deſtroy the Pariſh Churches and Miniſtry, and ſo is *for them*: For that would be a great alteration indeed.

4. If you ſhould think otherwiſe; yet if the Subſcriber, or Swearer *think himſelf*, that it is not *deſtructive*, but *governing* Dioceſans, that he ſubſcribeth to; it is not your Opinion or Expoſition, that bindeth him againſt his own; No, tho you were in the right, as to the *Impoſers ſenſe:* For, *Ignorantia non eſt conſenſus.* It's unjuſt to face them down that they mean what they profeſs they do not. Ask forty Conformiſts, whether they think the Government which they promiſe not to alter, be that Dioceſan form which *ruleth Pariſh Churches* and Paſtors, or that which *denieth their being*, and I think few will profeſs the latter ſenſe.

5. And ſuppoſe the worſt, that any Pariſh-Prieſt were of that mind; yea, and were really no true Paſtor, as to his own acceptance with God; he may yet be a Paſtor ſo far true, as is neceſſary to the Eſſence of the Church, if the People know it not: For the Innocent ſuffer not for the guilties ſin. If a man be a ſecret Atheiſt, or Heretick, or do counterfeit Ordination and Election, and really had none, and the People be deceived by him, and know it not while he *poſſeſſeth the place*, and *doth the work*; his Baptiſms and Adminiſtrations are valid to the Church, as a Church, tho not to himſelf and his Miniſtry. The *Jews* Church was not null, when the high Prieſts had no lawful call, but bought the Office of *Roman* Heathens.

XXXV. Obj. *But the Veſtry ſwears never to endeavour any alteration.*

Anſ.

Anſ. 1. The Veſtry was never empowred to give the ſenſe of the Church herein. 2. I never lived where any ſuch things as Veſtries were, but in *London*; unleſs you will call the Miniſters and Church-Wardens the Veſtry. And what's *London* to all *England*? 3. If they are ſo ſworn, it is as a new thing ſince 1661. But then they are *ſworn*, (whoever is for it) *never to endeavour to bring in Popery*, nor *deſtroying Dioceſans*, but only *not to alter Governing Dioceſans* (I doubt with more Officers than we wiſh continued.)

4. And whereas thoſe that I now deal with, ſay, That *indeed before* 1640. *Dioceſan Prelacy nulled not particular Churches and Paſtors, but now it doth by the alteration*; Let it be conſidered, that the Lawmakers are ſo far from profeſſing any *eſſential alteration*, that it is only the Long-Parliament, and the *Covenant Alteration*, that they complain'd of; and therefore ſwear Corporations, Veſtries, Militia, Nonconformiſts (by the *Oxford Oath*) and engage all Conformiſts *never to endeavour any alteration*. So that they thought that it was the old Government that they ſetled. And now all this great part of the whole Kingdom is ſworn, as I ſaid, *againſt Popery and foreign Juriſdiction*, againſt *Patriarchs*, and againſt putting *down pariſh churches and paſtors, that they will never endeavour it* (by conſent or execution of any mens commands). The alterations made before theſe oaths, were not eſſential.

XXXI. I add one more argument, That owning ſubjection to governing Dioceſans, as ſuch, nulleth not the ſubject Churches and Paſtors; elſe by parity of Reaſon, Subjection to Arch-Biſhops would null the Dioceſan Churches and Biſhops, which it doth not do; nor do you think it doth; yea, tho all Dioceſans ſolemnly promiſe to obey their Arch-Biſhops in their Conſecration.

XXXII. If you do know of any Miniſter that is for *deſtructive Dioceſans*, that will not nullifie the Offices of all the reſt, that never were of that mind or conſent: Yea, if the Law ſo meant (as you ſay, but prove not) you know how commonly Conformiſts ſay, that the *meaning* of the *Subſcription* and *Oaths*, is *only againſt* [*Seditious* or *unlawful ſorts of endeavour to alter.*] Be this true or falſe, it proveth that *thoſe men conſent not* contrary to their ſenſe of the Subſcription, and ſo renounce not their Churches.

XXXIII. Indeed the new Laws have made *Miniſterial Conformity* much harder than it was before 1640. And alſo *Lay Conformity without the Church-doors*, by the aforeſaid Oaths; and alſo Lay Conformity within the Church ſeemeth very hard in ſome particular Offices, eſpecially Baptiſmal Circumſtances. But I think the ordinary Communion in the Liturgy, is better than it was before: For 1. The Epiſtles and Goſpels are uſed after the new Tranſlation, which were uſed after the old. 2. Divers Collects have ſome miſtakes changed [*As on this day*] at *Eaſter*, *Whitſuntide*, when it was not on that day. 3. The Miniſter is newly enabled and required to keep all from the Sacrament, who are *not ready to be confirmed*, (that is, that are not *Catechized, and ready underſtandingly, to renew their baptiſmal*

ral Covenant) which is a very great addition of power: And if any practiſe it not, that's his fault, and a neglect of execution of his power; and when he puts ſcandalous Sinners from the Sacrament, he may ſay, [*As a Miniſter of Chriſt and Rector of this Church, I judg you unmeet for its Communion, and forbid it you.*] And no more is eſſential to his Church Diſcipline in Excommunication. It's too true, that the Exerciſe of this it clog'd with further Proſecution by him, in the Chancellors Court, which I think few will undertake. And it's true, that ſuch Miniſters are required to publiſh the Excommunications of Lay-men, paſt in the Biſhops names, tho it be according to ſuch Canons. as the *6th*, *7th*, *8th*, *&c.* But a man in Fetters, is a man: It changed not the Paſtoral Office, when Heathen Emperors perſecuted it, and when ſuch Chriſtian Emperors, as *Anaſtaſius*, *Zeno*, *Baſilicus*, *Theodoſius* 2d. *Conſtantius*, *Valens*, &c. vexed or caſt out thoſe that were not of their Opinions. It nulleth not the Office in *Switzerland* to have none but the Magiſtrates Diſcipline.

XXXIV. The Objectors grant, that, *If any Pariſh-Church ſhall by Miniſter and People conſenting, be formed according to the Rules of the Goſpel, they are true Churches, tho the Law ſhould be againſt them, or command the contrary.*

Anſ. 1. Much more then, if the Law be *for all that* is *eſſential.* 2. And doth not this ſay as much as I am pleading for? Name me, if you can, any thing eſſential, which all Miniſters promiſe not at Ordination? If any after renounce it, the crime is perſonal: Prove it before you ſay it, and forſake him, and charge not his fault on others.

I think you are not of their minds, that ſay, [*The Law bindeth every Subſcriber and Swearer to the ſenſe of the Impoſers, when he took it through miſtake in another ſenſe, becauſe they refuſed to explain it*; eſpecially, if he *declared* his ſenſe: Much leſs doth it bind him to *your ſenſe*, againſt *his own.*

XXXV. *But then* (ſay the Objectors) *ſuch Churches are Diſſenters; as ſuch you joyn with them, and not as ſetled by Law, and ſo it is but a Conventicle, and is excommunicated by the Canon, or you excommunicated for ſaying it is a Church, and joyning with it.*

Anſ. 1. What if all this be true? Doth it follow, that I muſt ſeparate from it? Are not your *private Churches* more unqueſtionably *Excommunicate*, &c. by the Canon, and yet you ſeparate not from them? Can you ſee but on one ſide?

2. But your Affirmation proveth not that the Law nulleth ſuch Miniſters, or Churches, as uſe the Liturgy, and ſubſcribe in the favourable ſence, tho it ſhould prove a miſtake. It muſt firſt be tryed and judged to be a miſtaken ſenſe, and even where they (ſtrangely) Excommunicate, *ipſo facto*, the *fact muſt be proved and declared* by the *Judg*, before Prieſt and people are bound to Execution, (tho the Law be *loco ſententiæ*;

the fact being proved and declared), no man is bound to do Execution on himself.

3. I would seriously advise these Brethren to think, *Whether all good Christian Men and Women are bound to study the Laws of* England, *before they may resolve what Church to communicate with*? yea, whether they must be all so *well skill'd* in *Law*, as to decide these Law-controversies, that *you and I are not agreed in*, and Lawyers themselves do ordinarily differ in; that is, Whether by Law the Parish-Churches and Pastors be changed and nulled, and Dioceses be made the only Churches, *infimæ speciei*? Must all forbear Communion till they are so good Lawyers? Why may it not suffice to know Christs Law, and to profess to obey it, and to do nothing against it willingly? He that will promise to Communicate with ths Church, but as it is established by Law, should have more skill in the Law than I have to know, how it is established; and every Communicant hath not so much more than I.

XXXVI. *But* (say they) *then you are bound to avoid scandal, by professing openly that you Communicate as a Dissenter, and not with the Church as established by Law.*

Ans. 1. Then I should falsly say that which I either think is otherwise, or am not resolved in. I tell you, Few can truly say this, if any.

2. What need this, when the open Profession of all Christians is, That it is a *Church* and *Worship* of Christs making, which they own and intend, and none that is against them? And when the Articles of the Church of *England*, and the Ordination covenant own Scripture-sufficiency, and disclaim all that is against Gods word: Must we be supposed to renounce Religion, when we meet to profess it? And surely for disowning any thing which the Nonconformists judg unlawful, all the Books written by them, and all the notorious sufferings in twenty two years, Ejection and Prosecution, are no obscure Notification of their Judgments, without speaking it at the Church Doors, or before the Assemblies: Must I openly protest against Independency, Anabaptistry, or Presbytery, (if I dissent) before the face of their Congregations, if I will Communicate with them?

3. But (to stop your demand) before I Communicated in the Parish Church, where I now am; I went to the Incumbent, and told him that I would not draw him into danger, or intrude against his will: I had been called by the Kings Commission, and after by the Lord Keeper, to debate about Alteration in the Liturgy, and Worship, and Discipline; and I thought that thereby I was by *Can.* 6, 7, 8. *ipso facto* Excommunicate, but not bound to do Execution on my self; and therefore if I were separated, it should not be my act; but I left it to his will: He took time, and upon advice admitted me.

Obj.

'Obj. *But you muſt tell them that the Pariſh Church hath no dependance on* 'the Biſhops, *but as the Kings Officers; and that it is Independent, and then you* 'fall not under our oppoſition.

Anſ. 1. How many Lawyers and Civilians do openly ſay (as *Crompton* before *Coſins* Tables) that all Church Government floweth from the King. And doth that ſatisfie you? 2. And why muſt the Pariſh Church and Paſtor needs be Independent? Will you have no Communion with Presbyterians? 3. And what if it be dependent on the Dioceſan, as *governour* (tho not as *deſtroyer*)? Is it any more deſtructive of its Eſſence, than to be governed by a Claſſis or Council?

XXXVII. As for your telling us, *Whom the Canons excommunicate, or how Lay-chancellors, Officials, Surrogates, Archdeacons,* &c. *excommunicate, what Oaths they impoſe,* &c. *tell them of it,* and not *us*, who are not reſponſible for other mens deeds. It no more concerneth our cauſe of Parochial Lay-communion, than to tell us how bad men ſome Miniſters are, nor ſo much neither: For I that willingly joyn in the Liturgy, will not willingly, if I know it, ſo much as ſeem to own the Miniſtry of any man that is notoriouſly *Inſufficient*, *Atheiſtical*, *Heretical*, or ſo *Malignant*, or *Wicked*, as to do more hurt than good. Avoid ſuch, and ſpare not.

XXXVIII. Obj. *They want the Peoples conſent, and ſo are no Paſtors.*

Anſ. The People ſhew their conſent by ordinary Submiſſion and Communion.

Obj. *The People muſt be ſuppoſed to conſent to the Law, which maketh them no Paſtors, but the Biſhops Curates.*

Anſ. Both the Suppoſitions are before confuted; both that the People are ſuppoſed to conſent to any Law againſt Gods, and that the Law maketh Curates to be no Paſtors.

XXXIX. To conclude the Objections about the Eſſence of Pariſh Churches. 1. The queſtion is not, Whether there be not a ſort of Dioceſan Prelacy, which nulleth them? 2. Nor whether there be not ſome men in *England* that write and plead for ſuch Dioceſan Churches as have no true *Epiſcopos gregis*, much leſs *Epiſcopos Presbyterorum* under them, but are *ſole Biſhops* in that *Dioceſs*? Nor of what number, power, or intereſt theſe men are of (againſt whom I have oft written)? 3. But whether the Law be on their ſide, or againſt them? for the old Dioceſan Government of ſubordinate Paſtors and Churches, is to me now uncertain: I did once incline moſt to the firſt ſenſe of the Law; but on ſecond thoughts hope better of it, and am not Lawyer good enough to be certain. 4. But if it ſhould be ſo, I verily think the *main body* of the *judicious godly Conformiſts think otherwiſe*, and therefore *conſent not* to renounce their Pariſh Government, but only to uſe it in ſubordination to the Biſhop. 5. And I am paſt doubt that all the Communicants of *England*, are neither bound to decide this Law-doubt, nor to underſtand it, nor to believe that the Law hath altered the Government.

6. And if they did *believe* it, they ought to keep on in Church Aſſemblies according to Chriſts Law, taking all that's againſt it, as void, as long as they are put *in no ſin themſelves*, nor the *Church* notoriouſly *renounceth its eſſentials*. 7. And if they were ſtated Members of other Churches (*e.g.* the *Greek*, the *Dutch*, the *French*); they might *occaſionally* Communicate in our Pariſhes tranſiently (without examining the Paſtors call and diſcipline, but judging by poſſeſſion and practice). 8. And if they ſhould prove no lawfully called Miniſters, their Office would be valid to thoſe that blameleſly were deceived and knew it not. 9. And if they were ſure that they were no true Miniſters, they may joyn with them in all Worſhip belonging to Lay-Chriſtians. 10. But if they prove able, godly Miniſters of Chriſt (tho faulty) ſetled by Law to the advantage of Religion in a Chriſtian Kingdom, where all are commanded thus to maintain national Concord; and the upholding thoſe Churches, is the very National poſſeſſion of the Proteſtant Religion, and it goeth for publick Diſobedience and Scandal to forſake them, and that at a time when many forſake them too for unjuſt grounds, and by ſuffering for it, ſtand to unwarrantable Accuſations of them, and ſharply Cenſure thoſe that do not as they, and oppugne Peacemakers, and all this after the old Nonconformiſts full Confutation of the Separatiſts unwarrantable way, and the doleful experience of Subverſion of all ſorts of Government; by the Proſecution of ſuch miſtakes, I ſay, If all this ſhould be the caſe, it is deeply to be conſidered.

XL. But the moſt effectual hindrance, is the opinion of *unlawfulneſs in joyning in the Liturgy*; yet my laſt Objectors confeſs that [*It is lawful to ſom, and that it is not Communion in it, much leſs in all forms, which they call* unlawful *to all*: And the ſober ſort are loth to ſay that the Millions of Chriſtians in *England*, and *Scotland*, who live where they can be in no other Churches, ſhould rather like Atheiſts live without all Church-Worſhip and local Communion.

And in gaining this, I have gained the better half of what I pleaded for. And they confeſs, and ſo do I, that publick Communion may be *one mans duty*, and *anothers ſin*, as circumſtances vary. I confeſs one man may poſſibly live under ſo intollerable a Miniſter, as is not to be owned. And even ſome of the high adverſaries of Nonconformiſts ſeem of this mind, and break the Canon; and having Paſtors, who they think do not heartily conform, but plead for Peace and Moderation; they revile them as *Trimmers*, and will not Communicate with them, but go out of their own Pariſhes (and thouſands ſeldom any where). Other circumſtances alſo may vary mens caſes.

But ſome Objectors at laſt tell us, that the great *difference* which they mean, is *different light*: *The old Martyrs, Reformers and Nonconformiſts, had not ſo much light as we, and ſo it was not their ſin; but greater light being now more common, it will be a common ſin to joyn in the Liturgy.*

And

Anſ. 1. It is ordinary and eaſie for men to magnifie their own underſtandings; but Gods Law was then the ſame as now; and they were bound to know it; Their ignorance might make ſin leſs (and ſtripes fewer) but could not make it none.

2. I have many Reaſons to think that it is *your light* that is *leſs*, and the *old Nonconformiſts* and *Conformiſts* (in this) that was *greater*.

1. That is the *greater light* that moſt agreeth with Gods Word, and the univerſal churches practice accotdingly.

2. The *writings* of the old Nonconformiſts yet extant, give *better reaſons* than the ſeperatiſts did, and therefore had *clearer light*. What vaſt difference is there in the writings of *Ball*, *Hilderſham*, *Ameſius*, (Manuductions) *Giffard*, *Paget*, *Bradſhaw*, &c. on that part, and *Johnſons*, *Cans*, *Penrys*, &c. on the other?

3. The *Theological* writings and labours of the Nonconformiſts in all other points ſhewed, that they were men of incomparable more light than the Separatiſts; and is it like that God would give men ſuch rare light only in church-communion, that had ſo little comparatively in the reſt of Divinity, except *Ainſworth*'s skill in Hebrew, (in other things by *Paget* laid too naked) how few old Separatiſts have left any conſiderable fruits of great light unto the church? Read the writings of *Cartwright*, *Dudley Fenner*, *Hilderſham*, *John Reignolds*, *Dod*, *Perkins*, *Bain*, *Parker*, *Ames*, *Bradſhaw*, &c. Beſides *Scots*, and all Foreigners, ſuch as *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Zanchy*, *Sadeel*, and hundreds more; and compare theſe with the Writings of the Separatiſts, and judg who had greater light.

4. Since 1660. all the *London* Miniſters, and others with them that offered the King to ſet up in the pariſh churches the old Liturgy with ſome alterations, were men (except my ſelf) who ſhewed in their Writings and preaching as much light as the Separatiſts have ſhewed, even *Brown*, or *John Goodwin himſelf*, (that wrote *Prelatical Preachers* are *no Teachers of Chriſt*): Where do they now ſhew greater light than others? this boaſt to me deſerveth pity more than confutation: *Anabaptiſts*, and others ſay the ſame, but I find much leſs light in them both, when I read and hear them; tho I truly love and honour all that is good in them: If you have ſo much more light than we and all the Reformed churches, ſhew it us in other excellencies.

XLI. But I muſt more particularly conſider of this Authors Allegation of my own words againſt me, eſpecially my Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy: And I do heartily thank him for calling me to review it. For, 1. I profeſs to write nothing which may not be amended. And 2. If mens miſunderſtanding turn my writings to a ſnare and ſcandal, it greatly concerneth me to remove it by explication, or by retractation of any thing that needeth it.

And 1. I do find that I have incauteloufly given ſome occaſion to the miſtake, for thol entituled my Book, not *againſt Dioceſan epiſcopacy*, but *againſt*

that

that ſort of Dioceſan churches, Prelacy and Government, which caſteth out the Primitive church ſpecies of Epiſcopacy, Miniſtry, and Diſcipline]; and tho to avoid miſtake, I ſaid in the Preface, *I here give notice to the Reader, that whenever he findeth me ſpeak as againſt the Engliſh Dioceſan Prelacy, I mean it as deſcribed by* Cosins, *and Dr.* Zouch, *and as relating to the Et cetera Oaths and Canons*, and *not in oppoſition to the laws of the Land*; Yet all this was not enough to avoid miſunderſtanding! Indeed I took the church Government to be deſcribed and judged of by the *churches own ſentence*, more than by the *Law*; and I had read the ſaid *Et cetera oath* and *canons* with the words that ſo *it ought to ſtand*, which I think could mean nothing leſs, than that ſo *by Gods Law it ought to ſtand*; and I had read the old canons, *6th*, *7th*, and *8th*. Which *excommunicate*, ipſo facto, *all men, without excepting Lords or Parliament Men*, who affirm that any *thing* in the *church Government*, by Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, *Deans*, *Arch-Deacons*, and *THE REST* that *bear office therein*, is *repugnant* to the *Word of God:* And I read the canons that forbid *Ordained Miniſters to preach till they are further licenſed by Biſhops*; *yea, and in the church or elſewhere ſo much as to expound any Doctrine or Matter, but only to read Scripture and Homilies*, &c. with much more like this. 3. And then I took the *ſtated reſtraint* of the Miniſtry, with *Lay-chancellors*, and *officials decretive power of Excommunication*, and *abſolution*, and the foreſaid Civilians denying *all Govenment to Presbyters*, to have been *quoad exercitium quantum in ſe*; at leaſt an overthrow of pariſh churches, Rectors and diſcipline. 4. And I thought that the Biſhops and Chancellors could never have ſo long done all this, and ruled by theſe canons, if the Law had not been on their ſide. 5. And I thought that the Authors of the canons of 1640 being a *convocation*, it was to be called the *Church of England:* and ſpecially when I found the moſt highly honoured Doctors pleading, there was no Biſhop *but Dioceſan*, and no church without its proper *Biſhop*.

By all theſe inducements (with long ſad experience) I oft ſpeak ſo incautelouſly, calling this, *the Engliſh dioceſan frame*, that the Reader might eaſily think that I meant it was that frame that was ſetled by law; whereas having read *Pryn*, *Huntley*, *Leighton*, and others that deny the law to be for it, and being my ſelf a ſtranger to that caſe of Law, I ſhould have more fully ſeparated the *Law caſe* from the new convocation caſe, and much more from the deſtructive Innovators caſe, who nullified the foreign churches, with whom it was that I diſputed; and ſpecially conſidering that the canons and oath of 1640. were after caſhier'd by Parliament, and never ſince reſtor'd, no not by the Parliament of 1662.

Upon all this, 1. I retract all words that ſeem to determine the caſe in Law, (if any ſuch be there) or that by darkneſs tend ſo to the Readers error. 2. And all words that make the writings of ſuperconformiſts and ſubverters, or changers of the church government, or the canons of the convocation 1640 to be the ſenſe of the Church of *England*; when it is ſaid, that *before its ſence was otherwiſe, and alteration* is now *abjured*, or diſowned by moſt

of

of the Land; and conformiſts uſually profeſs another ſenſe: Upon this very reaſon I write this ſhort Debate to avoid the injuring of the Readers of my Writings, about the Engliſh Dioceſan frame.

XLII. The Book I animadvert on, is called, *Mr.* Baxters *Judgment and Reaſons againſt communicating with the Pariſh Aſſemblies as by Law required.*

Anſ. I am for communicating with them in the *eſſentials* of *Chriſtianity*, and *Communion*, as the *Law requireth*, if I underſtand it, becauſe the Law of Chriſt requireth it: But in whatever circumſtances any law ſhall be againſt Chriſts Law, I communicate not according to ſuch a Law.

XLIII. All that he citeth out of my writings, *p.* 2, 3. is againſt his cauſe, which he thought was for it, as I have proved. What he citeth § 7. the firſt is unproved, the ſecond I own, and is nothing for him.

XLIV. P. 5. And oft throughout, he alledgeth, that *I make the Pariſhes not compleat particular Churches.*

Anſ. No wonder; thoſe may be true churches, that are not compleat in integrity or degree; will you ſeparate from all churches that are not ſo compleat? I know not of any ſtrictly compleat on earth: many true churches are incompleat as to *integrals*, much more as to ornament, order, and ſtrength: And all particular churches are leſs compleat than the univerſal; and that on earth, alas how far from compleat: Believe him not Reader, that *R. B.* is againſt your joining with all churches, which he proveth to be not compleat, yea, or to be very faulty and defective in point of Holineſs, Love, or Order of Miniſters or people: But they are true churches in eſſentiality, tho parts of a Dioceſs, as that is of a Nation; not meer parts of the loweſt ſingle Church. *P.* 6. § 2. What I ſay of ſuſpending the power, is not nulling it in the office; and what I ſay of *practice* by *canons*, and *viſitation Articles*, is not ſaid of *Law*; much leſs of all the Churches and Paſtors conſent to them; and what I ſay of *miſgoverning in exerciſe*, is not ſaid of a *national profeſſion*, that ſo *it ought to be.*

P. 7. He citeth my words further againſt *reſtraint* of the Miniſters power. But 1. That nulleth not Chriſts Inſtitution of it. 2. More Power is given. As 1. To deny the Sacrament, as is ſaid, to all that are not ready to be confirmed. 2. To deny abſolution to all the ſick, who do not *humbly* and *earneſtly deſire it*, &c. And the Power of doing it by Miniſterial *Application of Gods Word*, is all that is properly miniſterial, though they take all cogent power from us: Mans taking away our power, is but hindring the exerciſe *quantum in ſe*, but the Power is of Chriſt, which they cannot take away.

P. 8. They cannot ſuſpend our commanded *act*, (but only our doing it with *liberty and advantage*): I can refuſe the Sacrament to the unfit, tho it be to my trouble.

P. 9. I ſay there are many additions to the old conformity, that make the caſe harder to Clergy and Laity than of old: But I there maintain that none

none of theſe additions do make Parochial Communion now pleaded for, unlawful.

XLV. P. 10. He ſaith, *If we might not endeavour to reſtore the old Prelacy, then not to give ſtrength to it being reſtored: And* (ſay others), *leſt we be perjured, having ſworn and covenanted againſt it.*

Anſ. This needeth impartial Conſideration: They ſay, *That our covenant engagement maketh that unlawful to us, which was lawful to the old Nonconformiſts.*

But 1. Did not Gods Law make it unlawful to them, or to us before? Then you think we covenanted to do ſomewhat that Gods law bound us not to; if ſo, it was ſuperſtition; and is not adding our ſelf-made vows and duties, as bad as adding Ceremonies?

2. Yea, they then thought *Browniſm* a ſin; and if they miſtook not, we cannot by covenanting turn ſin into duty.

3. *Ad hominem*, the Author profeſſeth Independency: And I ſuppoſe he knoweth, that the chief of that way, did ſome write, to prove that the Covenant bound not (at laſt), and ſome likened it to an Almanack out of date; and ſome ſaid, it was a League which was diſſolved, and ſo bound not; and how great a party thought that it bound them not from pulling down both King, and many Parliaments, and conquering *Scotland*, *res ipſa loquunta eſt*: And even King and Parliament, Lord Spiritual, Temporal and Commons, have declared it their judgment in the Corporation Act and Declaration, which bindeth all the Corporation Officers to declare without exception, that *there is no obligation on them, or any other from the Oath, called the ſolemn League and Covenant*: It's true indeed, that the *Presbyterian Miniſters, and Soldiers, and People*, thought that this Covenant bound them to reſtore the *King*; and ſaid, *Let us keep our covenant, and truſt God with the iſſue*; and *G. Monks* Army Officers in their addreſs to him, glory in it, not doubting but the King would find ſuch his beſt ſubjects; but the Law that bindeth men to declare that there is *no obligation* on them or *any other*, tells them they did err when they thought it bound them to reſtore the King: Whether this be true or not, I meddle not with; but by this you ſee, that there are few in the land of any party, ſave Presbyterians, that can charge us with Covenant breaking (herein) for going to the Pariſh Churches, without contradicting themſelves or guides; but this is but *ad Hominem*.

4. But what words be they in the Covenant that we violate? did it mean, *If power reſtore the Liturgy, and Biſhops, and will ſuffer no other Churches, we will rather all give over all worſhip of God in churches, than we will join with them*? This were a wicked Oath, and could no more oblige us, than to give over all family worſhip; I hope few ſober men ever ſo ſware.

5. I

5. I ſo little conſent to the *corporation declaration*, that I do believe that I was bound by that vow to do as I have done in going to the Pariſh Churches. For 1. I am bound by it againſt *Prophaneneſs, and all that's contrary to ſound Doctrine and Godlineſs*: But to forſake all publick Worſhip of God without neceſſity, is *prophaneneſs*, and *contrary to Godlineſs*. 2. I am bound in my *place and calling to oppoſe Popery*; But to tell all the Proteſtants in *England*, that they ſin if they forſake not all the Pariſh Churches, is to prepare them for the reception of Popery, ſeeing that will be the National Religion which poſſeſſeth thoſe Pariſh Churches: By deſerting our Gariſons we ſhall deliver them up. 3. I am bound by it againſt *Schiſm*; and I am not able to excuſe it from being Schiſm, if under all the obligations that now lye upon us, I ſhould by my conſtant avoiding the Pariſh Churches, even unto ſufferings declare, that I take their Communion for abſolutely unlawful, and ſo ſlander ſo many Churches of Chriſt, and ſeduce others with me into the ſame error and ſin: This would be Schiſm and Covenant-breaking in me; whatever it is in others.

XLVI. Obj. *But you ſwore againſt Prelacy and Liturgy*, and *now you ſtrengthen them.*

Anſ. 1. As the Covenant was made the terms or teſt of national Church Union, excluding all the Epiſcopal, who were half the Kingdom and more, I think it was a raſh ſinful Engine of unavoidable diviſion: But when I took it, it was not ſo impoſed, but offered to them that were of that mind, and I ſaw not then that ſnare.

2. I never ſwore againſt the Common-Prayer, nor againſt the Engliſh frame of Prelacy, (much leſs, all Epiſcopacy (any further, than *in my place and calling to endeavour Reformation according to the word of God, and the example of the beſt reformed churches*: And this I have endeavoured to the utmoſt of my power, perhaps more than my accuſers.

And 3. There is much good in the Liturgy, Pariſh Order, and Government: I never did covenant againſt that; and therefore the Miniſters who laboured for Reformation and Concord 1660 and 1661, thought they kept their *covenant* by craving ſome *amendments*, and not an *abolition*; and if we did think any thing to be bad that was good, we muſt not be obſtinate in that error; forſaking the good which is our duty, is not the way to amend any ſin or error; avoiding Gods publick Worſhip, and living like Atheiſts (ſave in private) is not the way to amend the faults of publick Worſhip or Government: Praying to God for what we want, and owning the Scriptures, and Chriſtian Religion, and communicating with Chriſtians on lawful terms, is not encouraging any ſin in church Prieſts or Prelates, unleſs men by our duty will be encouraged to ſin; and we muſt not forſake duty to avoid ſuch mens encouragement: the ſons of the *Coal* are moſt angry with thoſe that come neareſt to them in all things ſave their ſin and error; and ſay, thoſe that ſtand afar off cannot hurt them: I do not juſtifie all

that is in every Assembly that I join with; must I needs renounce Local communion with every Independent, Presbyterian, or Anabaptist church, that I dissent from, for fear of strengthning them: I covenanted as much against Schism as faulty Prelacy; and yet if I must join with no church that is guilty of Schism, alas whither shall I go!

4. I humbly desire you to examine, whether your way be not a breach of the covenant you plead; not only as it advantageth Prophaneness, Popery, and Schism, but as it strengtheneth that which you say I strengthen; he knoweth not *England*, who knoweth not that perceiving the error of unwarrantable separation, and the unjust accusations of the Liturgy and churches, used by very many (besides some failings in some private churches) hath been, and is a grand cause of encouraging too great a number, even to superconformity, and to the fierce opposition of us, and to the utmost confidence in their own way: and as you charge me more than others as drawing more to the communion of Godly Protestant Parish Ministers (that is, to christian catholick love, peace, and communion): So do the Sons of the *Coal*, the superconformists more fiercely revile me as stopping more, than you have done from their extremities.

Gods Word is a sufficient rule, keep to that, and fear not breaking any self-made laws.

XLVII. Obj. But by this *latitude you may join with Papists, and say, you judg of them according to Christs description.*

Ans. I answered this in the former book: When I joyn with any church as a church, I join with them as meeting to profess and practice christian faith and worship, their by-faults I own not: But if they openly profess Idolatry or Heresie, instead of Worship and Faith, or if they meet to practice any sin which renders the whole church or worship rejected by God, I must not assemble with them, but avoid them; which I must not do for tolerable failings, lest I avoid all the world: I say again, I will cast away my Wine or Broth for Poyson in it, which I will not do for a fly: If the church renounce Christs description in the essentials, notoriously, I will not call it a church against their own consent: But if they do it only in some Accident or Integrals, I will only disown those faults.

XLVIII. Obj. *But*, say they, (*p.* 13. 14.) *It is impossible there should be two national churches, at least in one nation; therefore by joining with a Parish you can be no part of the national church; tho we confess that if you join with a Parish Assembly that forms it self into a compleat single church, and the people consent to take the Parish Minister for their Pastor, and the Minister should exercise the whole power of a Pastor in this Parish church, Mr.* B. *may hold communion with this Parish church, and not own the Diocesan constitution.*

Ans. Of two churches in one assembly I spake before. 1. Doth this Author think that *exercise* of power is as essential to a Minister as Power: Yea, that it must be the *whole power* that is exercised; and so that no one is a true

true Paſtor among the Presbyterians, when the *Claſſis* exerciſeth the higheſt part of the Power; nor in *Helvetia*, where Diſcipline is unexerciſed; nor in *England* from the firſt Reformation: Were all the Conformiſts that ſubmitted to Dioceſans no Church-Paſtors? nor no Independents, whoſe Churches having many Paſtors and Elders, no one exerciſeth (no nor hath) more than part of the power? *Integrity* and *eſſentiality*, *office* and exerciſe, are not all one.

2. All good Miniſters that I know in the Pariſh Aſſemblies, do conſent to the Paſtoral Office, and the people love them; and ſhew their conſent by ordinary Communion; and they exerciſe all eſſential to the office, tho under the *reſtraints* of Government, not owning (in conſent) *deſtructive*, but *governing* Dioceſans, ſome as *de jure divino*, *lawful*; ſome as beſt, ſome as neceſſary, many as merely impowered to a cogent Government by the King; and doth not your conceſſion imply, that theſe are true Churches? of intolerable men I ſpeak not.

3. What you confidently deny, is certainly true: There may be *two national churches* in one nation, if not three; that is, the word is equivocal, and hath divers ſences; and it is not called *national*, *becauſe* all perſons in the nation are of it, but becauſe that the diffuſed parts of the Nation own it formally in a publick national relation.

1. A *Chriſtian Kingdom* as ſuch, is by many called a *national Church*; thus *England* is ſuch.

2. A coalition of the moſt, or all the publick Miniſters in a Nation in Synodical Agreements for Communion as ſuch, is called a *National Church*; ſuch alſo is *England*.

3. The ſubjection of the moſt of the Clergy in a nation by conſent to ſome Eccleſiaſtical Primate, Patriarch, or other conſtitutive, governing Head (as a Biſhop is in his Dioceſs) may make a national Church in another ſence.

The ſame men may be of divers of theſe equivocal Churches; or if part be for one form, and part for another, yet agreeing in the ſame ordinary, external Communion; one part may be called national as well as the other. The queſtion is *de nomine*, the name equivocal from diverſity of relations: I own, 1. A Chriſtian Kingdon. 2. I own a national aſſociation of Pariſh Churches and Paſtors. 3. Tho theſe ſubmit to Dioceſan ſuperiority, and be parts of a Dioceſs, but true ſingle Churches, I do not therefore ſeparate from them. 4. A national Church, headed by one conſtitutive, paſtoral Head, I diſown; call which you will the national Church.

But (ſaith he of his approved pariſh Church), *P.* 14. *Such a Church aſſumeth to it ſelf all that paſtoral power that in purſuance of Canon and Statute Law, is fixed in the Biſhop.*

Anſ. Incogitantly ſpoken; Do all *Independents* aſſume the power of *Ordination*, *Juriſdiction over others*, Citations, Licencing, Subſpendings, De-

gradings, silencings, instituting, inducting, &c. which are so fixed on the Bishop: If none of this be pastoral power, then the appropriating it is no depriving parish Ministers of pastoral power; and to be under *Magistrates power* nulls not the pastors.

XLIX. What he saith about *unlawful terms of Communion*, p. 21. &c. in the instances of *kneeling*, *putting off the hat*, *standing up*, &c. I answer, 1. The Author all along seemeth to forget, that I am not *accusing him*, nor telling every man his duty, but only giving the Reasons of my own and such others practice: so they make a long ado, to vindicate him whole Manuscript I answered, and say, *His question was only, whether it be lawful to communicate with the churches as setled by Law*, and *not in other respects*? When I ever told them, I meddle with none of their Questions, but my own, viz. 1. *Whether I and such other do well or ill in that communion we hold with the Parish Churches*? 2. *Whether all Protestants in England are bound in conscience to renounce and avoid Communion in the Liturgy with all Parish Churches and Chappels, and rather to give over all church worship*?

I only gave my Reasons, why that Manuscript (divulged and boasted of as unanswerable) changed not my Judgment; and I answered that in his Arguments, which went further than the question put by them, and assaulted my own assertions; having before in my *Christian Directory*, and *cure of Church divisions* (without naming him) fully answered his printed Reasons, to prove it unlawful to use an imposed form or Liturgy, *especially because Ministers must use their own gifts*.

But if any man believe that it is a sin to *communicate kneeling*, *or standing*, or *sitting*, *unless he lye down as Christ did*; or at any time, save at a feast or supper; or any where *save in an Inn* or an *upper room*, or with any *women*, or more *than twelve*, or if they think it sin to *kneel at prayer*, or be *uncovered*, or to *sing Psalms* in our *Metre and Tunes*, whether these men should separate from all the Churches that will not receive them in their own way, or how far they do well or ill that will not let every man do what he will, is none of the case that I have before me: It will not follow, that I must separate from a Church that bids me kneel, and be uncovered, &c. because you take it to be sin: put not your measures on all others.

And here because fame maketh Mr. *Faldo* the Author of the Vindication, which I answered, that I may so far vindicate him, as to shew, that it's scarce likely; I ask, whether if Mr. *Faldo* did well as a pastor to keep up a church at *Barnet* many years, which would not endure the singing of a psalm of praise to God, but constantly forbore it, tho his Judgment was against them, (besides that many of them *were* not only against Infant Baptism, but further differ'd in other things)? was this communion more lawful or laudable than with honest parish Ministers in the Liturgy? Did he the *whole office* of a pastor: What if the Bishop had forbid him to sing psalms? is not the Church State more concerned in the *whole congregation*, than

than in an abſent Biſhop? what greater omiſſion or defect is there in many Pariſh-Churches?

I again ſay, that I am ſo far of the Judgment of *Hilderſham*, *John Ball*, &c. that I had rather joyn (*cæteris paribus*) in a Church that uſeth the Pſalms, Chapters, and all the Lords-day Prayers in the Liturgy, before Sermon, than one that only giveth us one Pſalm (or none) and a Pulpit-prayer and a Sermon without all the reſt of Church Worſhip.

I. I will conclude all with repeating a little of the Explication of my miſuſed writings:

I. The paſtoral *Overſight* of the *Laity* by the Elders, or Biſhops of the ſeveral Flocks, is of Chriſts Inſtitution, and belongs to all true Presbyters. And tho in neceſſity it may be done by divers tranſient Miniſters, *pro tempore*, moſt regularly, every Church ſhould have its ſtated Paſtors.

II. Where ſuch Churches are large, the work requireth many Miniſters, where each one hath but part of the *Charge*.

III. Reaſon and Church-conſent among theſe, made one a Preſident over the reſt, and called him the Biſhop pecularly, (if it were in *Marks* days, as *Hierom* ſaith, it was in *John*'s). And tho this be not eſſential to a Church, it is lawful, and fit; and at laſt it grew to ſo great a Reputation and Opinion of neceſſity, that all Churches had ſuch Biſhops, and gave them a Negative voice, and ordained not without them, and defined Churches as eſſentiated by Relation to them, *Eccleſia eſt plebs Epiſcopo adunata*. If now ſuch men as *J. O.* Mr. *Nye*, Dr. *Goodwin*, &c. ſhould have in one Church ſix or ſeven young men of their own training up to be their Aſſiſtant-presbyters, I do not think an Independent Church would take it for any crime that he ſhould have a Negative voice in acts of Order and Diſcipline, or that they ſhould ordain Miniſters therein without his Conſent.

IV. By degrees ſingle Congregations increaſed to as many as our great Pariſhes that have Chappels; and tho ſtill they communicated in the chief Church at ſome ſpecial times of the year; they ordinarily met in divers places, and the Presbyters officiated ſome in one meeting, and ſome in another; at firſt, whoſoever the Biſhop daily ſent; but after their particular Tyths or Chappels were aſſigned to each; yet all together were eſteemed but one Church, governed by one Biſhop, and his Colledg of Presbyters.

V. When they increaſed yet more and more, fixed Chappels were aſſigned to fixed Presbyters; but not as diſtinct Churches, but parts of the Dioceſan Church, tho at laſt they were larger than one Biſhop and Colledg could guide, according to the firſt Inſtitution.

VI. Yet long every Chriſtian City had a Biſhop and Church, and every incorporate big Town, like our Corporations or Market-Towns, was called a City (not becauſe it had a Market, as a reverend Slanderer feigneth

eth me to ſay, but becauſe Cuſtom the maſter of Language, called all Corporations and great Towns by that name): But at laſt the Biſhops being loath to diminiſh their Juriſdiction, decreed that very ſmall Cities ſhould have no Biſhops, *ne vileſcat nomen Epiſcopi.* And in proceſs of time in ſome Countries, the name *Civil*, or *City*, was appropriated at the Princes pleaſure to ſome very few Corporations, peculiarly priviledged above the reſt: So that a King that would have had but one Biſhop in his Kingdom (as it's ſaid that all the *Abaſſian* Empire hath had but one) might have done it by calling but one Town a City.

VII. Yet the People and Biſhops being ſenſible that there was more work for a Biſhop in a City-Dioceſs, than one could do; in many Countries they had Rural Biſhops ſet over *Populous* country Churches: And tho theſe were ſubject to the Dioceſans, yet hereby the Churches were multiplied: But the Biſhops ſoon grew jealous and weary of theſe Rural-Biſhops, and moſt places put them down, and ſet up inſtead of them a kind of Itinerant viſiting Presbyters, empowring all Arch-Biſhops and Ach-Deacons, till at laſt to ſave themſelves the labour, and yet not diminiſh their Dominion, they ſet up the Courts of Lay-Chancellors, Officials, and many ſuch Offices, beſides the Arch-Deacons, Surrogates, *&c.*

VIII,. In *England* (as is agreed by moſt Hiſtorians,) at firſt one Biſhop had but one Church or Temple. (And at *Luindisfarne* ſaith *Bede*, *Itwas ſo poor a thing, that it was a houſe thatcht with reeds.*) The Paſtor of this one Church was to convert as many as he could in all the Countrey about him. The Heathen Country might be his Dioceſs, but not his Church. The converted Chriſtians got into ſeveral Monaſteries, and not into Pariſh-Churches. Theſe Monaſteries were partly for Society in Religious Exerciſe, and partly for Studies, like Schools to Educate Youth for the Miniſtry. So that long a Dioceſs was only the Biſhops Church with divers Monaſteries. At laſt, Gentlemen for their convenience built and endowed Pariſh-Churches; the Biſhops old ſingle Churches being called the Cathedrals: And finally, by the help of Princes, all the Land was divided into Pariſhes, ſubject to the Cathedral-Biſhops, to whom Deans and Chapters were added in imitation of the old Biſhops Colledg of Presbyters in every ſingle Church.

IX. When the Rural-Biſhops were put down, the Presbyters power in their ſeveral Pariſhes was ſomewhat enlarged: And the Dioceſſes at laſt became ſo great, that the Biſhops were fain to commit more of the overſight to the Presbyters: Tho they kept them under by ſevere Canons, Lay-Deputies, and the Cogent Sword.

X. It grew then a controverſie among the Papiſts themſelves, whether the Pariſh Incumbents were proper Paſtors, and had any Power of Government, and how much. And my Objectors confeſs, that they were reputed Paſtors among the Papiſts, and that *Linwood* calleth them *Paſtors*, and the

Laity

Laity Over: I have cited in Treat of Epiſ. *Eſleſacus*, and many more that prove it. *Ant. de Dom. Spalatenſis*, is large and full in it. *Spelman* in *R. Æl-fricks* Law, ſhews that the Biſhop and Presbyter made but one of their ſeven Orders: A great ſort of the Schoolmen ſay the ſame. Moſt Drs. ſay, That the Presbyters *eſſentially* as *Sacredotes*, have the power of the Keys, *in foro interiore*; by which they mean not, a power that muſt be kept *ſecret*, but that which conſiſteth in the *perſwaſive uſe of Gods word on Conſcience*, privately or publickly, as diſtinct from *Magiſterial and Cogent Power*. And if they be of *one Order*, then if *one* be a *Paſtor*, the other is ſo alſo. That they are taken, but *in partem curæ*, is nothing againſt it, but for it. For equal Presbyters in one Church, have each but *partem curæ*.

The Reformation finding things in this caſe, determined none of the diſputes, *de nomine*, Whether Pariſh Rectors ſhall be called *Epiſcopos Gregii*, or *Paſtors*, or *Rectors*, or *Incumbents*; but uſe theſe names promiſcuouſly. Nor did they diſpute whether the Pariſhes are *Political Churches*. But the *Definition*, and not the *Name*, is the thing now before us in debate. God hath given every ſuch Miniſter the eſſence of a Paſtoral overſight of his Flock: Men may hinder the Exerciſe, but can no more alter the Chriſtian Office Power, than they can deprive a Husband of the power over his Wife. And if the Dioceſans at laſt have been neceſſitated to permit the eſſential Paſtoral power (by the word) to the Incumbents, having none elſe to uſe it by. But Lawyers have taught many to call nothing *Government*, that is not *Cogent* on the unwilling; and ſo to ſay, that *Government is not in the Presbyters*, but the *Biſhops*; and that all is derived from the King; which is all true, of *Cogent Government* by the Sword, *in foro exteriore*; but not as to *Paſtoral Government* of the Flock by *Gods word*. As Biſhop *Bilſon* of Obedience hath diſtinguiſhed, and applied well at large.

XI. Now to come nearer our Caſe, Dioceſan Biſhops have put down the ranks of Biſhops which of old was ſetled as *Preſidents over the Presbyters in every Church*, in *Cities*, and of the loweſt Order (deſcribed by *Ignatius*, and *Cyprian*, and others): Every loweſt Church hath not now a Biſhop over the Presbyters, as it had for divers hundred years. And by this they have unchurched all the old ſort of Churches in the ſenſe of them that ſay, There is no Church where there is no Biſhop over Presbyters: And they have ſet up a Dioceſan Church and Biſhop, only where ſhould be many Churches and Biſhops; and thus, *ad hominem*, I argued with them, &c.

But indeed *this Parochial Epiſcopacy*, or *Preſidency* being wrongfully ſaid to be *Eſſential* to the Church (being at moſt but uſeful to peace, *ad melius eſſe*) and the Epicopacy or Paſtoral care of the Laity without any power over the Clergy; being it that is eſſential to ſingle Church Paſtors; In truth no man can alter this. In Conſent and *Reputation*, it is altered by thoſe

those that think Parish Curates no Pastors, and deny any Essential power over their Flocks. But it is not in Consent and Reputation destroyed by them that acknowledg their Essential power, and subject only themselves as Pastors to the oversight of Dioceſans and Magistrates. They do but destroy the *Ancient sort* of *Episcopacy* of *humane Institution* (which was over *Presbyters in each Church*), but not the Episcopacy over the Flock which is of Christs Institution.

XII. And whether most in *England* are of this Opinion, or of that, for *destructive* or for meer *governing Episcopacy*, and which way the *Laws* go, and what may be called the *sense of the Church*, when *Convocations* and *Bishops seem* to differ, and men change their Opinions with the *Age and Interest*, it is impossible for me to be sure.

But I know how they govern, by what Canons, and by what Courts; and as all their Cogent power is from the King, it is no wonder if they be chosen by him: But the old sort of Bishops that had no forcing power, was so constantly otherwise chosen, that their Canons nulled the Magistrates choice. And our present Canons since 1604, tho they null not the Parochial Pastorship, do so far restrain it, as I hope my Conscience shall never approve. But yet, for that I will not forsake what is of God, nor make mans failings a pretence against my duty to God and Man, to the Violation of Love, Unity and Peace.

Yet I will try by distinct speaking to make both the Case and my meaning plainer, if I can: And thereby to shew, that our case differeth but gradually from the old Nonconformists, as to Lay-mens Parochial Communion, where there are honest Ministers. And that the old Nonconformists had better Evidence, Scripture and Reason on their side, than either those Innovators, who make Parish-Pastors to be but *de specie*, of humane Institution, made by Bishops, and changeable by them, having just so much power as they please to give them; or the *Brownists*, that are so much of the same Principles, as to think that mens Laws or Canons can change the form of the Office, or that judg it nullified by tollerable Imperfections, and Communion made unlawful by such faults, as are found in almost all the Churches on Earth.

Qu. Whether according to the description of the Scripture, and the exposition of Dr. *Hammond* himself, all qualified Parish Ministers be not true Pastors and Bishops of the Flocks, and with their consenting Christian Communicants, true particular Churches; and *de facto* all be not in the power given them by God, which is essential hereto, and in the power generally acknowledged by the legal Church?

Anſ. I have spoken to this so largely in my Treatise of Episcopacy, (and there added the testimonies of Writers, old and new, Protestants and Papists (that I will give but a breviate of it here.

The

The eſſence of the Church Miniſtry conſiſteth in *POWER* and *OBLIGATION* FROM CHRIST, to teach, to guide in Worſhip, and to overſee and guide the Converſation and Communion of the Flocks; If it were not *of Chriſt*, they were but officers of men, *de ſpecie*, even of an office of mans making.

Dr. *Hammond* ſaith, that Chriſt gave the Keys only to the Apoſtles, and they only to their Succeſſors: That there is no evidence that there were any of a ſecond order of Presbyters in Scripture time; that this order was after made by Man, Mr. *Dodwell* ſheweth how and why; and more fully than Dr. *Hammond*, aſſerteth, that ſuch Presbyters have no more power than the ordaining Biſhops intended to give them: Or ſaith Dr. *H.* If they have a *firſt power*, it is ſuch as may not be exerciſed without a ſecond; ſo that it is indeed no true power to act: And the Dr. plainly tells the *London* Miniſters *p.* 80, 81. *There is no manner of incongruity in aſſigning of one Biſhop to one Church, and ſo one Biſhop in the Church of Jeruſalem, becauſe it is A CHURCH, not Churches: being forced to acknowledg that where there were more Churches, there were more Biſhops.*

And he denied our Presbyters, that were not Dioceſans, to be Biſhops (both City and Country Presbyters): And conſequently that our Pariſhes were no Churches.

And on theſe grounds he and Biſhop *Gunning*, and ſuch others, judged Presbyters Ordination null, becauſe they were no Biſhops.

And the ſaid Dr. (tho I thought he had been next *Petavius*, one of the firſt that had expounded the new Teſtament Elders, to be all Biſhops of ſeveral Dioceſſes) yet tells us that he thought moſt of his brethren were of his mind herein.

And when we in *Worceſterſhire* formed a Pacificatory Aſſociation of the Epicopal, *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and Peace-makers, agreeing lovingly to practice ſo much in Doctrine, Worſhip and Diſcipline as we were for, according to our ſeveral principles, forbearing each other in the reſt, and Dr. *Warmſtrie*, and Dr. *Tho. Good*, being for Biſhops, ſubſcribed to it, Dr. *Peter Gunning* wrote largely againſt ſo doing to Dr. *Warmſtrie*, and took him off, upon theſe aforeſaid principles; and they then called their Judgment, the Judgment of the Church of *England*, and wrote as if the Church had been of their mind, and gone their way.

I wrote a large Anſwer to Dr. *Gunning*'s Paper, (not printed) and proved that the old Proteſtant Biſhops and Doctors were of another mind, largely citing their teſtimonies in my *Chriſtian Concord*, and plainly warned Engliſh Proteſtants to take heed of theſe Innovators, and that the name of the *Church* and *Epiſcopacy* deceive them not againſt the Church and Proteſtant Cauſe; many roſe againſt me for this with great indignation, eſpecially Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall*, and two or three learned Writers, and would make the world believe, that it was the Church of *England* which I ſought

to defame and bring under ſuſpition, and which owned *Gretins* and his way of Reconciliation with *Rome*, whenas it was for departing from the profeſſed principles of the reformed Biſhops and Doctors, and from the book of Ordination, and other writings of the Church that I blamed them: Yet would they needs claim the name of the Church of *England*.

And it is not here ſeaſonable for me to tell, how many and how great men in 1661, and 1662 ſeemed by their words and doings to be full (at leaſt) as high as they, nor how they expreſſed it, nor how many ſtrongly conceited by the Act that requireth reordination of men ordained by Presbyters, and by the number rejected who refuſed it, That the Parliament had been of their mind, and much more the *convocation*, called *the church-repreſentative*; eſpecially when they heard men call the old Biſhops and Arch-Biſhops (ſuch as *Uſher*, *Downame*, *Pedle*, &c. in *Ireland*, and *G. Abbot*, *Rob. Abbot*, *Grindal*, and many ſuch in *England*) *Puritans* and *Presbyterians*: And when *Pet. Heylin* maketh Arch biſhop *Abbot*, and the Biſhops and Clergy in his days to be of one mind (vilified by him) and Arch-biſhop *Laud* and his Clergy after, of another: In this caſe I gave the name of the *preſent Dioceſans*, to thoſe that thus claimed it, and pretended ſo confidently to the preſent poſſeſſion of it; but I thought not their claim juſt: And when I ſometimes uſed the name of *Engliſh Dioceſans*, for this ſort who nullifie the Paniſh Churches and Paſtorſhip, it was but to notifie them that ſo claimed it, ſuppoſing I had oft ſufficiently opened my ſenſe, and uſually added that *they nullifie them not effectively*, but *quantum in ſe*, and by their conſequences.

But I again now tell the Reader, that I think the Judgment of the church of *England*, conſidered as *humanely conſtituted* by publick profeſſions, and by Law, (much leſs as *divinely conſtituted*) is not to be meaſured or named from any innovators, or any that moſt confidently claim it, or think they are uppermoſt at the preſent, and thereby have that right; but (as Divine) by Gods word, whoſe ſufficiency we all profeſs; and as *humane*, by the publiſhed Church profeſſions; that is, the Liturgy, the book of Ordination, the 39 Articles of Religion, the Apology of the Church of *England*, the Defence of that Apology ſet in all Churches, the book of *Homilies*, *Nowels* Catechiſm, the *Reformatio Legum Eccleſ.* the Canons, and the licenced books of the Proteſtant Biſhops and Doctors, ſuch as Arch-bp. *Cranmers*, Bp. *Hoopers*, Arch-bp. *Parkers*, Arch-bp. *Grindals*, Arch-bp. *Abbots*, Arch-bp. *Edward Sandys*, Arch-bp. *Whitgift*, Bp. *Pilkinton*, Bp. *Jewel*, Bp. *Ally*, Bp. *Babington*, Bp. *Morton*, Bp. *Hall*, Bp. *Davenant*, Bp. *Prideaux*, Bp. *Brownrig*, B. *Potter*, Bp. *Miles Smith*, Bp. *Carlton*, Bp. *Bayly*, Bp. *Parry*, Bp. *Cowper*, and many more ſuch, (beſides thoſe in *Ireland* aforeſaid): And ſuch Drs as Dr. *Whitaker*, Dr. *Field*, Dr. *Crakenthorpe*, Dr. *Sutlive*, Dr. *Maſon*, Dr. *White*, Dr. *Airy*, Dr. *Chaloner*, Dr. *Ward*, Dr. *Willet*, Dr. *Holland*, and abundnace more; beſides all other old licenced Writers: I think that all theſe

these do fitlier notify and denominate the Church of *Englands* Judgment, than the Writings of one Irish *Arch-Bp.* and *Dr. Hammond*, and *Dr. Gunning* (since *Bp.*) and a few more such in the points wherein they differ from the rest, (tho *Grotius* and their Chaplains be added to the number.)

And now I will add this further evidence in the conclusion, (besides that as I said before) the present Laws put us to abjure alterations, and therefore sure they never thought that they so altered the Government themselves, that even while they say that the Parishes are no Churches, but parcels of Churches, and the Priests are no *Bps.* of the Flock, most really acknowledg them the *thing*, that deny the *Name*. And the argument from the *definition* is stronger than from the *Name*.

And here I will but name first, the Scripture descriptions of a *Bp.* and 2. *Dr. Hammonds* exposition of those Texts. 3. And the matter of fact among us.

The first part of the *Bps.* office is *teaching the flock*.

Under this teaching part, 1. the Bishops office is to preach to them, 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3. *Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the over sight* (Or Episcopacy) thereof, &c.

Dr. *Hammond: The Bps. of your several Churches I exhort.——Take care of your* several *Churches*, and *Govern* them, &c.

Quest. Whom doth the Law require to do more *in feeding and guiding the flock?* The Incubment that preacheth daily, or the Bp. that never seeth the most, nor ever preacheth to one Flock of many? Who are they [that are among the Flock] the Incumbent that dwells with them, or the *Bp.* that is a stranger to them?

1 Thes. 5. 12. *We beseech you brethren to know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work sake, and be at peace among your selves.*

Dr. *Hammond. Pay your Bps. as great a respect as is possible, for the pains they have taken among you.*

Quest. Who *Laboureth among them* most in the several parishes, publickly and privately? The Bp. that never saw them, or the Incumbent that layeth out all his Study and Time on them? Who are most among them? Who most admonisheth them? What is meant by [*among themselves?*] Is it that *Lincoln shire, Leicester-shire, Northamton-shire, Buckingham-shire, be at peace among* themselves, from *Gainsborough* to *Oxford-shire*? or is it not rather that neighbour Christians that see each other, so live in peace?

1 Tim. 5. 17. *The elders that rule well, are worthy of double honour; especially they that labour in the word* and *doctrine.*

Dr. *Hammond: Let the Bps. that have discharged that function well, receive for their reward twice as much as others have; especially those that preach the Gospel, to whom it was news, and continue to instruct congregatons of Christians in setled Churches.*

Queſt. On whom doth the law impoſe moſt preaching? On Bps. or on pariſh Prieſts? And who doth moſt of that work? Heb. 13. *Remember them who have the rule over you, who have ſpoken to you the word of God.*

Dr. *Hammond: Set before your eyes the Bps. and governours, who have been in your Church, and preached the Goſpel to you.*

Queſt. Ask the pariſhes who thoſe be?

2 Tim. 4. 2. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall judg the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his Kingdom, preach the word, be inſtant in ſeaſon, out of ſeaſon, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long ſuffering and doctrine.*

Not only Dr. *Hammond*, but all that are for Prelacy expound this of a Bps office.

Queſt. Ask the people who moſt performs it.

2. The Bps Office is alſo to watch over all the Flock, perſonally, by conference, inſtruction, counſel, admonition, exhortation, reproof, comfort, as every one ſhall need Saith Bp. *Jer. Taylor* Pref. to Treat of Rep. *No man can give account of thoſe that he knoweth not.*

Acts 20. 10, 28, 31. *I taught you publickly, and from houſe to houſe.—Take heed to your ſelves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you Bps, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchaſed with his own Blood.—Therefore watch, and remember that by the ſpace of three years I ceaſed not to warn every one night and day with tears.*

Dr. *Hammond. Inſtructing both in the Synagogues, and the private Schools, and in your ſeveral houſes whither I alſo came.—Wherefore ye that are Bps. or governors of the ſeveral Churches.—Look to your ſelves, and the Churches committed to your truſt, to Rule and order all the faithful under you.*

Queſt. Is this done more by the Dioceſans, or by the Incumbents? Do Dioceſans teach from houſe to houſe, from *Southwark* to *Chriſt-Church*, from *Newark* to *Alesbury* or *Tame*? Who doth the law appoint to warn every one in the Church, from houſe to houſe, and night and day, &c.?

Col. 1. 28. *Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wiſdom, that we may preſent every man perfect in Chriſt Jeſus*; Heb. 13. 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves, for they watch for your ſouls, as thoſe that muſt give account.*

Dr. *Hammond: Obey thoſe that are ſet to rule over your ſeveral Churches, the Bps. whoſe whole care is ſpent among you, as being to give account of your proficiency in the Goſpel.*

Queſt. Is it the Dioceſan or the Incumbent that the law requireth to preach to, and warn every man, &c.? And that watch for their Souls as thoſe that muſt give account? Is not the incumbent of this or that pariſh fitter to watch and give account of each Soul, than the Dioceſan for a whole Country, or many Counties, who never ſaw them? Can he do as *Ignatius's*

Biſhops,

Biſhops, that muſt take notice of all the Church, even Servants and Maids?

3. The biſhops office is to be a *viſible example* to all the flock, of Humility, Meekneſs, Patience, Holineſs, Charity and good Works. Heb. 13. 7. *Remember them who have the rule over you, who have ſpoken to you the word of God, whoſe faith follow, conſidering the end of their converſations.*

Dr. *Hammond*: *Set before your eyes the Biſhops —— obſerve their manner of living.*

Queſt. *VVho can obſerve his example whom he never ſaw nor knew? Or who can make an unknown man his pattern? Do the flocks ſee more the Incumbents example, or the Dioceſans?* It is their example that *ſpeak to them the word of God*, that the Apoſtle ſets before them: And who be thoſe?

Perhaps it will be ſaid, that *Fame may tell the Dioceſs of the example of their Dioceſan, tho they ſee him not.* I anſwer, 1. But the Text ſpeaketh of thoſe that *preach to them.* Fame may as well tell us of the good works of any other biſhop, as of the Dioceſan: Many biſhops in *London* live near us; it may tell us of any other good mans life. What is this to the Text?

1 Pet. 5. 3. *Neither as being Lords over Gods heritage, but being examples to the flock.*

Dr. *Hammond*: *VValking Chriſtianly and exemplary before them.*

Q. *VVhat? Before them that never knew them, nor could do? Doth the Dioceſan or the Incumbent more walk as a known example before the Pariſh flock, for their imitation?*

4. It is part of a biſhops office as a general Miniſter, not only to teach the Church, but to preach to thoſe that are yet no Members of the Church, Matth 28. 19. *Go and diſciple me all nations.* 1 Tim. 5. 17. *They that labour in the word and doctrine.*

Dr. *Hammond*: *To preach the Goſpel to whom it was news.*

Acts 26. 17, 18. *To whom I ſend thee, to open their eyes, and turn them from darkneſs to light, and from the power of Satan unto God*, &c. Not that fixed Paſtors muſt wander to do this, as unfixed Miſſionaries; but within their reach.

Hence Dr. *Hammond* noteth out of *Clemens Rom.* That they are *made Biſhops over the Infidels that ſhould after believe*: And biſhop *Downame* ſaith, that the City and Territories are their Dioceſſes, when the Chriſtians were but few; and as Dr. *H.* ſaith, But one Congregation, which one biſhop only with a Deacon or two ſerved: So that either a Dioceſs was no Church, or it was a Dioceſan Church of Heathens, ſave that Congregation.

Our great Pariſhes, that have 70000, or 60000, or 40000, or 20000 ſouls, have not the ſixth part (that I ſay not the tenth) ſo many Communicants. Who is it that preacheth moſt for the Converſion of the reſt, Atheiſts, Sadduces, Infidels, Hereticks, Bruitiſts, and impious ones? Is it the Dioceſan or the Incumbent? Who doth the Law moſt require it of?

5. It

5. It is part of the Bishops office to *Catechize* or Teach the Novices that *have need of milk, and are as Children in danger of being tost up and down and carried to and fro with every wind of Doctrine.* See Eph. 4. 14, 15, 16 Heb. 5. 11, 12. With Dr. *Hammonds* Paraphrase.

Quest. Doth the Law and Church lay more of this on Diocesans, or parish Pastors?

6. It is the Bishops work to defend the truth against gainsayers, and confute adversaries, and stop the mouths of Hereticks, Infidels, and other enemies; as is confest by Dr. *Hammond*, on many Texts to *Timothy* and *Titus*, as 2 *Tim.* 2. 24, 25, &c. Not by force, but by evidence of truth. And doth not the Law and Church lay more of this on the Incumbents, than the Diocesans (who are not *Ubiquitaries*)?

II. The Second part of the Bps. office, *is Guidance, and officiating before the Church in publick worship; in subordination* to *Christs Priesthood.* 1. By confessing sin, and to be the subintercessor, or the mouth of the Church in publick prayer, thanksgiving, and praise to God. 2. In Consecrating, and Distributing, and giving in Christs Name, the Sacrament of Communion. 3. To bless the Congregation in the name of the Lord, &c. All these Dr. *Hammond* maketh the Bps. office, and so doth the Scripture, and so did *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, &c. Citations in a confessed case would but be tedious.

Quest. And who doth this most in all the Churches? Who confesseth sin, prayeth for mercy, praiseth God, administreth the Lords Supper, blesseth the people, &c. The Bp. to many hundred Churches, or each Incumbent to each Church? And on whom doth the Law most impose it? And what doth the Diocesan in it, more than any one of the rest?

2. Dr *Hammond*, on *Acts* 2. And *Acts* 4. 33, 34, 35. Sheweth that it was the Bps. part, to *receive all the offerings of the Communicants*, and *all the tythes* and *first fruits*, &c. Who doth this most? The Diocesan in all the Parishes of his Diocesse, or the Incumbents?

3. Dr. *Hammond*, (and many old Canons before him) tells us, that the Bp. was out of the Church stock, to *take care of all the poor, orphans, widows, strangers*; Deacons were herein but servants under them. Dr. *Hammond*, on 1 Cor 12. 28. *The supreme trust* and *charge was reserved to the Apostles* and *Bps. of the Church.* But the poor will starve if the Incumbent with his assistance do not more in this than the Diocesan.

4. It is the Bps. office *to visit the sick.* Jam. 5. *Call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him*, &c. Dr. *Hammond*, *in v.* 14. *Because there is no evidence, whereby these may appear to have been so early brought into the Church (that is Subpresbyters) and because* πρεσβυτεροι *in the plural doth no way conclude that there were more of these elders than one in each particular Church, and because elders of the Church was both in the Scriptures style, and in the first writers the title of Bps. and lastly, because the visiting of the sick* ancient-

eminently mentioned as one branch of the office of Bps. therefore it may very reasonably be resolved that the Bps. of the Church, one in each particular Church, are here meant.

Quest. Is it the Diocesan (perhaps 50 Miles off) that the sick must send for, or that the Law and Church impose this on, (to visit the sick, and pray over them, &c.)? or is it the Incumbents?

III. But the great doubt is, who hath the *Power of Government*, and who *actually governs*, (not by the sword) but with the *Ministerial Pastoral Government*?

And here it must still be remembred. 1. That this particular power of the Keys or Government, is only by the word of God opened and applied; as Bp. *Bilson* hath proved, and is commonly confessed; some call it *Persuasive*, some *Directive*, some *Doctrinal*; But it is not such meer *direction or persuasion* as any man may use to another; but such as is the part of one commissioned to it as his office; An *Authoritative persuasion*, and a *Judicial decision*, as by an *intrusted steward* of Christ: but only *on Conscience*, and *on Volunteers*, and not by any power to exercise force on body or purse. 2. That *Governing*, and *unjust restraining this power*, is not *taking it away* from the Pastor; and laying *penalties* on men for *exercising* some part of that which Christ hath given, doth but bind men to bear that penalty when the exercise is necessary. Now let us consider *wherein* the Governing Power doth consist.

1. It primarily consisteth in judging who is capable of *Baptisme* and so Baptizing them. This is the first and great exercise of the Keys, and that *in foro exteriore*. To judge who shall be taken publickly for a Christian, and in Christs Name to invest him solemnly in the number of the faithful, delivering him a sealed pardon of all his sins, and a grant of right to grace and glory. Can there be a higher exercise of the Keys?

Matth. 28. 19, 20. It is the Apostles work [*Disciple me all nations, baptizing them*, &c.] And Dr. *Hammond* thinketh that in Scripture-time there were no *Baptizing Presbyters*, but *Bishops*; and indeed it is so great a use of the Keys, that this chiefly condemneth Laymens and womens Baptizing; at least the *trying* the *Catechized*, and *judging* of their *capacities* must needs be the prime great act of Church-Power, whatever be said of the *execution*.

Now *Papists* and *Protestants* generally place this Power in *Parochial Incumbents*, yea, and in all other *Presbyters*: Even those that convert Countreys of Infidels, and are under no particular Bishop, must baptize and judg of the Catechumens capacity for baptism; and are *Parish Incumbents* denied this Office-power of the Keys? and is it the Diocesan or they that use it by baptizing?

Obj. The Canon requireth them to baptize all Infants brought according to law, and so not to be the Judges.

Ans.

Anſ. You ſhould ſay, *and ſo commands them how to judge.* The *Magiſtrate* may *command* men *how* to do their office-work, and yet neither be the *maker* nor *unmaker* of the office, (tho he miſtake:) If *Rulers miſgovern*, that's *their* ſin, but the office of Paſtors is ſtill the ſame, and we muſt not miſobey, but ſuffer, and as Biſhop *Bilſon* ſaith, *Go on with our work* as long as we can. 2. And to bid them *do more than they would*, is not to null their power of doing leſs. And to *puniſh a man for his duty*, is not to *diſoblige* him from it, till it truly *diſable him.*

2. A ſecond great exerciſe of the Church Keys, is *Miniſterially as from Chriſt to declare his Laws*, and *charge men to obey them*, both the Church together, and particular perſons ſingly. As *Legiſlation* is the firſt and great part of *Chriſts Government* [before *Judicature*] ſo the Miniſterial *declaring Chriſts commands*, and *demanding obedience*, is the great act of Government.

The ſame word therefore comprehendeth *feeding* and *ruling*, 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3. *&c.* Matth. 24. 45, 46. *Who then is a faithful and wiſe ſervant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his houſhold, to give them meat in due ſeaſon?* It is *ruling* by *ſeaſonable feeding*. 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12. To be *over them*, is exerciſed by *labouring amongſt them, and admoniſhing them*, 1 Tim. 5. 17. *Ruling well*, is nothing greater than *labouring in the word and doctrine*, 1 Tim. 3. 2. *A Biſhop muſt be apt to teach* : Dr. *Hammond*, *One that is able and ready to communicate to others the knowledg that he himſelf hath.* Heb. 13. 7, 17, 24. *Ruling the flock is by teaching and watching over them.* To be the *greateſt* is to be moſt *ſerviceable to all* ; to be ruled by them, is to *know* them, to *eſteem them highly in love for their works ſake, to obey Gods word delivered by them, and their conduct in mutable circumſtances*, Heb. 13. 7. 1 Theſ. 5. 12 And to *imitate their good examples*, 1 Pet. 5. 3.

And what law forbids Incumbents to *promulgate Chriſts commands*, and *charge men to obey them*? Or to go to any negligent perſon of his Flock with the ſame charge ? or to go to any Drunkard, Fornicator, Railer, and to tell him from God of his ſin and danger, and exhort and command him to repent and amend ? And who moſt doth this work among us?

3. Another part of Government is to *judg profeſſing Chriſtians capable of Sacramental Communion, and admit them, and deliver it them as Chriſts Miniſters, by his commiſſion, and from him*; And therein to renew their publick abſolution, and their Covenant priviledg, and their delivered part in Chriſt, and right to life: None dare deny that this is a high part of the power of the Keys, and proper Government, to judg who is capable of Church Communion, and receive them, and deliver them from Chriſt, the pledg of life.

And all Papiſts and Proteſtants almoſt, judg this power eſſential to the Prieſthood, and common to all Parochial Incumbents: And the Church of *England* (as I ſaid before), 1. Delivereth it to them in Ordination. 2. Requireth them to catechize and certifie for ſuch as ſhall be confirmed; and

methinks the Dioceſan here uſeth leſs of the *judicial power* than the Incumbent, for he doth but *lay his hands* on them and ſay a prayer over ſuch as come to him; for no man can dream that he can examine all the people in his Dioceſs ſo far as to judg whether they are fit for Communion: Therefore he is ſuppoſed but to *execute* the *judgment* of the *certifying Incumbent* (If he take all at a venture, without a certificate, or knowledg, or if the Incumbent be unfaithful, I cannot help or excuſe that). 3. They are required to keep away all that be not confirmed, or *ready*, and *deſirous of it*. 4. They may hear any juſt accuſation of the ſcandalous. 5. They may admoniſh him, (if he will ſpeak with them). 6. They may refuſe him if obſtinate and impenitent. 7. They may declare the reaſon why they do ſo, as Chriſts Miniſters by his Authority, and tell the Church their duty to avoid the Communion of ſuch. 8. They may bind him over to anſwer his contumacy at the Bar of God; and what of this is denied by the Church, to belong to the Incumbents Office? and who elſe is capable of doing this in Pariſhes that have multitudes of ungodly perſons?

If all this ſhould be made ſo *difficult* by the *multitude* and *badneſs of delinquents*, or by *bad Canons*, or *bad Government* of the *Church* by *Dioceſans*, *Officials*, &c. and thereby be almoſt all *left undone*, I cannot help that, nor excuſe it; but what I have ſaid againſt *ſuch doing* is too little: And if *Prieſts* be ſo *bad*, that they will (any where) ſooner ſcorn it than practice it, at the rate that it muſt coſt them, I am as much againſt ſuch Prieſts as others are: But I will not therefore make the *Office of Chriſts Miniſters*, the creature of man, and mutable at his will, nor will I forſake faithful Miniſters for the ſake of the perfidious; no nor for their own tolerable faults or imperfections.

And now conſider ſeriouſly, 1. Whether there be any *eſſential* part of the office of a Paſtor, denied by that which may juſtly be called *the Church of England*, to the Pariſh Incumbents. 2. And whether incomparably more of it, even of the *government of the flocks*, by the *Keys of Chriſts Inſtitution*, be not by Law and Canon required, and in fact performed by the ſaid Incumbents, than by the Dioceſans. And whether *any uſe* it, if they do not.

If it be alledged, that I have in my Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy, named many inſtances in which they are deprived of the exerciſe of the very eſſentials; I ſtill anſwer, that if any ſhall by miſgoverning Canons or practiſe lay penalties on them that will perform their office, theſe do their part to deſtroy it; but *their ſin* may conſiſt with the *true office* that is *hindred*: If we cannot pray without penalty, we are yet bound to pray: And if any ſuch penalties ſhould prevail with any Miniſters to caſt off ſo much of Diſcipline as is indeed their duty, their office is ſo far deſtroyed as to its exerciſe: But it is not every ill Council, Canon, Biſhop or Prieſt of old when

they began to be corrupted, that changed and nullified the Paſtoral Power and Office as from Chriſt. I have repeated things over and over here, becauſe I would not be miſunderſtood, nor leave a ſnare behind me to miſlead men.

The ſum again is, 1. The Paſtoral Office *in ſpecie* is inſtituted by Chriſt and his Spirit, therefore the eſſence of it is unchangeably fixed by him; and no Biſhops or Churches may change it, by pretending they may give Presbyters as their ſervants what degree or kind of power they pleaſe; or make the office another thing.

II. The ſaid office in *mutable accidents* or *circumſtances* may be altered by *Princes Laws*, or the ſeveral *Churches Agreements*, and thus far it is humane.

Of the *Divine* ſort was the *Apoſtolick* and other extraordinary Prophetick offices: And the ordinary *Presbytery*, commonly called Prieſthood, and Elders ſetled over particular Churches, were *Epiſcopi Gregis*; Biſhops, over the flock.

And of the *humane ſort* is the *Preſidency of one* in every *ſingle Church over* the reſt of the *Presbyters*, who was the *Epiſcopus Presbyterorum*, a Biſhop over the Presbyters of one ſingle Church as well as over the people: This was the old *Epiſcopacy* of the firſt three Centuries; this is it which I ſay *our Dioceſans* have put down; and we that would have them reſtored, and would have ſuch a Biſhop and Aſſiſtant, Elders in *every Church*, are by the heighth of impudency, ſaid to be *againſt Biſhops*, becauſe we would have them reſtored to each Church (tho not as eſſential to it, as hath been thought of old) yet as a way of peace, to comply with Antiquity, and avoid ſingularity; and they that put down many ſcore or hundred Biſhops and inſtead of them would have but one, call themſelves Epiſcopal.

III. Whether Arch-bps. (Dioceſans.) as ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles in the miniſterial care of many Churches (by the word and not the ſword) be of Divine or Human Inſtitution, I am in doubt.

IV. The cogent Power by the Sword is only the Magiſtrates; and if Dioceſans appropriate this only, they are Magiſtrates; and thereby take none of our office from us.

V. The *eſſence* of the Pariſh miniſterial overſight being of God, *de ſpecie*, and the *accidents* that are *mutable* from *man*, the *exiſtence* of the office in *individual* perſons, is *not without conſent of the Paſtors*; ſo that no man can be a Paſtor againſt or without his will; (nor yet without a capacity in *qualificati n.*; ſo that if you prove any perſon to be *uncapable*, or elſe to have truly *diſclaimed* and *renounced* the *eſſentials* of his office: I am not about to perſwade you, that ſuch a man is a true Paſtor.

VI. But then we muſt know, that *indeed it is ſuch* an *incapacity*, or *renunciation*, and not a *tollerable defect*; nor ſubſcriptions and Oaths, which by *unſeen conſequences* may *ſeem* to renounce it, when the man *took them in a*

ſenſe

ſenſe which renounced it not: For tho ſuch a man may *greatly ſin* by taking Oaths or ſubſcriptions in a forced ſenſe, which plainly taken would infer worſe, yet his *ſin* is not a *renunciation of the office*, if he declare that he meant it in a better ſence, and took it on ſuch miſtake; for we muſt not for bare *words* againſt mens *meaning*, quibble or diſpute our ſelves into unwarrantable ſeparations out of Chriſtian Communion, eſpecially when it is ſpecially neceſſary.

VII. And if any *lay-men*, or *men* unauthorized will *uſurp the Keys*, or any *Councils* will make hurtful *Canons*, and hinder men in the work appointed by God, we muſt be faithful and patient, and God in due time will judg and decide all cauſes juſtly.

VIII. The *office-power* is *eſſentially related* to the work; ſo far as *Parochial Incumbents* are *allowed the work* as of *Chriſt*, they are acknowledged to be *Paſtors and Biſhops* of the flocks, tho the *name* were denied them; and ſo far as the *Biſhops office* may be *delegated* to *Lay-men*, or to *Clergy-men of another Order*; ſo far it is Humane, and not proper to them by Gods Inſtitution. They therefore that ſay, *All Dioceſans Juriſdiction* may be ſo *delegated* to them that are *no Biſhops*, but that the *Paſtoral Rectorſhip* by *Word*, *Sacraments and Keys cannot be delegated to any* men that are not of the ſame office; do thereby ſay as much, as that the *Dioceſan govcrnment is of men* (and may be changed by men) but the *Paſtoral Incumbency* is of Chriſt, and cannot be changed.

The Lord that inſtituted it, protect it; and ſave it from Satans moſt dangerous aſſault, which is by getting his own ſervants into it by *error*, and *malignity*, and *ſtrife*, and *cruelty*, to do *his work* as the *Miniſters of Righteouſneſs*, and as by *Chriſts Authority*, and in *his name*.

London Aug. 13. 1684.

Poſt-

POSTSCRIPT

Aug. 25. 1684.

HE that gave me notice of this Book which I answer, did withall send me a Manuscript to be privately answered, containing the very same things, but somewhat enlarged: His displeasure against my former mention of his private Writings to me, and the Contents, made me confident that he would not have any thing Published which I should answer to his last: By which I found my self in a notable strait: For if he at once privately sent me his reasons, and also in another Book Printed them, if I should answer his private papers (which reason forbad me doing in my condition, for his use alone) I should judg my self forestalled from answering the Printed Book, because the matter being the very same (and 'tis likely by the same man) I should be supposed to have broken the Laws of Civility, to have answered his private papers. But (having no Amanuensis, or Scribe to take any Copy of his papers, or my own) I thought it the best way to return his unanswered (they being Written for my use, which Reading will as fully serve as answering them) but supposing the Printed papers must be answered, I inserted also an answer to the strength of all his additionals in the Manuscript.

And at last he giveth me some notice of his thoughts of publishing the Manuscript, or a vindication of it. Which falls well for the Readers use, that I have answered that Manuscript before it is Published, without taking notice of it, and [illegible] avoiding wordy altercations.

The Author professeth himself my great acquaintance. Who he is, I know not; but he seemeth to be a very rational sober man. God forbid that I should ever contribute (unless duty do it accidentally) to the grievance of such men. I doubt not but he speaketh as he thinketh. And I doubt I have given him occasions by some uncautelous words in my writings. I truly thank God and him, that I am called to review them, and to clear my sence before I die. And I adjure the tearing persecuting sect, to think no more strangely and odiously of our differences in this case, than of the sharp contention of Paul and Barnabas; or that men should scramble if Gold and Pearls were scattered in the streets, where dogs and swine would never strive about them. Gods servants would please him: we are all of weak understandings: The Wisest best know their weakness: The rest are neerest the state of the Fool, who rageth and is confident. It is impossible but offence must come, Luke 17. 1. But wo, wo, wo, to any who will make canons so extreme hard for men to agree in as terms of their Union and Communion, and excommunicate all that say a word against any word, ceremony, circumstances or office of their train; and when they have done, cry out against men for not agreeing to every syllable, which a thousand to one are uncapable of understanding, and the better men understand them, the more they dislike them.

A Short Answer to the Chief Objections in a Book ENTITULED: *A Theological Dialogue*, &c.

§ 1. THE chief matter of this Book is already answered by the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. 1. 10. 1 Cor. 3. Rom. 16. 16, 17. Eph. 4. 4. to the 17. Phil. 2. 1, 2, 3. 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. John 17. 22, 23, 24. And 1 Cor. 12. And Acts 20. 30.

The Spirit and Stile of it is answered in the third Chapter of *James* throughout.

I have nothing then to do but to answer the pretended argumentation of it: For the Author shall not draw me from my Defensive part, to play the part of a plaintif against others, or to waste my time in altercations, and spend many sheets to tell the world that another man hath not skill to speak sence, and that he seduceth others by ambiguous words, and by confusions.

Obj. 1. To prove us sinful for being members of the Church of *England*, he saith Pag. 15. [*Is he not* by Communion in the Sacarment of Baptisme made a member? Page 13. *Is not Baptisme* (*according to the Liturgy*) *a symbol of incorporation into the Church of England? Confirmation another? receiving the Lords Supper another symbol*? &c.

Ans. 1. Baptism as such incorporateth no man into any particular Church, but only into the universal, as it did the Eunuch, Acts 8.

2. The ceremonies or circumstantials of Baptism, only shew what men submit to, rather than to be unbaptized, and not what particular Church they are of.

3. This objection would insinuate that all that are Baptized in the publick manner in *England*, were thereby incorporated into an unlawful Church, which they must by being rebaptized, or by open renunciation disclaim, And so that it is not Lawful to Communicate with any that were Baptized in the Parish Church, till they have repented it, or are

Rebaptized, or Penitent openly. And if you muſt have all in *England* renounce their Baptiſm before you will take their Communion for lawful, the ſame reaſon will hold againſt your Communion with all the reſt of the Churches on Earth. And when you cut off your ſelf from all, ſaving a ſhred, are you a Member of the undivided Body of Chriſt?

4. If our Baptiſm in *England* doth incorporate into their Church (which you ſuppoſe is no *Church*, being a falſe Church), doth not Baptiſm into your Church incorporate Perſons into yours? And what then, if your Schiſm prove a Sin? What if Rebaptizing prove a Sin? What if the Covenant deſcribed by your Client, (to obey none but Chriſt, in matters belonging to Worſhip) prove a Sin? are they all guilty of all theſe, and ſuch others?

Obj. II. *All that are liable to a Church Excommunication when they have offended, are declared Members of the Church. But all Communicants and Native Inhabitants are ſo. Therefore the Law hath excepted none.—How comes it to paſs, that the Church hath power of excommunicating any Perſon, but by vertue of Incorporation, which ſhe hath by the ſame Law? He that is not in the Church, how comes he to be caſt out?—Is he not by Communion in the Sacrament of baptiſm made a Member?*

Anſ. 1. Doth their eſteeming you a Member, prove that you are ſo?

2. You know that they excommunicate Papiſts, and Atheiſts, who deride them for it, and ſay, It's a ſtrange Church that will caſt us out, becauſe they cannot compel us to come in.

3. If this be a good argument, that all are of their Church that are excommunicate, then you are either ſafe from Excommunication; or of their Church, whether you will or not: If to make good your argument, you will aver that no Separatiſt, Independent, Presbyterian, Anabaptiſt, or Quaker, was ever excommunicate, or impriſoned as ſuch, you will change the Current of Intelligence, and comfort many that can believe you, and teach them how to eſcape a Priſon for the time to come. But if not, you make your ſelf and all theſe parties, incorporate Members of the Church of *England*, as well as me.

4. Do you think a Lay-Civilian by Excommunicating, can prove or make a man a member of any Church againſt his will? Then mens Argument againſt Pariſh Churches, for want of conſent, is void. They may be made ſuch againſt their wills.

5. But tho few men diſlike the Lay-Excommunicators and Abſolvers more than I do (nor grudge more at the Biſhops and Deans who uſe them, and let them put their names to the Excommunications; eſpecially of the poor Church-Wardens for not ſwearing, *&c.*) yet let us not render them cauſeleſly ridiculous. I imagine that they excommunicate not known Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, and ſuch like, out of their Church (who they know were

were never in it) but out of the Universal Church: If this be not their sense, let them give it you themselves, for I am not bound to be their interpreter.

And yet to moderate our Censures of them, I'le tell you a wonder: Within this hour I received a Letter of credible Intelligence, of a Chancellor who hearing of a Conventicle not presented by the Church-Wardens, and being told that they met to repeat the publick Sermon, said, God forbid that they should be hindered.

Obj. III. Page 8. *A Church in a sense is a Christian Kingdom, that is, a Royal Nation under Christ their King. But there is no such Gospel-Church in your sense; for there was neither Christian Kingdom nor King in the Apostles days.*

Ans. The Institution may be in the Gospel before the existence: Christian Kings and Kingdoms are neither unlawful, nor need'ess, because there were none then. The Prophets not only foretel that Nations shall come in to Christ and serve him, but that all Nations that do it not, shall perish. And Christs Commission to his Apostles was, *To go and Disciple all Nations* (as much as in them lay) *baptizing them.* Nations as such, were, first to be *discipled*, and *then baptized*, (Infants are part of Nations). And *Matth.* 23. Christ would have gathered *Jerusalems* Children (all the *Jewish* Nation) into his Church, as a Hen gathereth her Chickens under her Wings. And *Rom.* 11. Only their own unbelief broke them off from being a National Church, (including Infants). And it is part of the Saints triumph, that *the Kingdoms of the World are become the Kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ.* If you will read Mr. *Beverlys* Book, called *The whole duty of Nations*, it will give you full proof of this.

Where hath the Gospel *extensively* much prospered where Princes and Rulers were not Christians? The *Turks* give liberty of Religion. And yet the sometime famous *Greek* Churches, (*Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Coloss*, *Ephesus*, *Laodicea*, *Philadelphia*, and more than all the *West*, are Apostatized, or withered to a few ignorant vicious scandalous Christians.

Obj. IV. 8. *If such a confederation in lawful Circumstantials, as well as Integrals, will make a Church, I know not why we may not have a Catholick Visible Church organized, if this be a due acception of a Church.*

Ans. This is as much as to say, *If the name Church may be used equivocally* (as all words must) *of several sorts, then all those sorts may be the same.* I deny it. If you dislike the use of the name, you have your liberty as a *Grammarian* to forbear it. But sure the *Name* and the *Thing* are not all one, nor the Controversies about them. 2. But we have a Catholick Visible Church Organized, as I have oft proved against the Papists, *viz.* under one, Christ the Head, and his Ministers as his subordinate Officers.

Obj.

Obj. V. Page 3. *If you touch a mans finger, you touch the man: we have communion with an* integrum perpartes; *and with a Genus by the Species; and with both by individuals: Nay as every part of the Scripture, one verſe or ſentence of it makes up ſence; ſo every part of the Liturgy as in form and manner therein contrived, is Liturgy; and worſhip thereafter is according to the Liturgy, tho it be but part of the worſhip.*

Page 20. *As for the falſeneſs in Integrals, it gives the denomination to the whole; for an Integral part is an eſſential part of the whole.* Much more there is to the ſame purpoſe, making him guilty of all that uſeth a part.

Anſ. 1. You have the freedom of uſing words at your pleaſure, but not impoſing them on mankind; when neceſſity hath taught the World to diſtinguiſh eſſential and integral parts, you have no authority to confound their Language, by the quibble of calling *Integrals eſſential cauſes of the whole*: *A totum per aggregationem*, as a heap of Sand, or a field of Graſs, is not conſtituted of a proper eſſentiating form, and ſo homogeneous matter aggregate is all the being it hath. And if you make contiguity an eſſential cauſe, or how elſe you will, you have liberty of ſpeech: But we will not be cheated by it to believe that it cauſeth any more than *Totality* or *Integrality*, and the abſence of it is a privation of no more. And all mens Graces, Obedience, and Worſhip, are defective in point of Integrality and degree, and I hope you will not ſay that they need no favour, or pardon, or amendment.

2. All human actions have their faults: muſt we therefore do nothing, or converſe with no men? *England* is one Kingdom; If there be one or many faults in its Laws or officers, may we therefore obey none that are faultleſs? The Laws are the Rule of National Juſtice; may a Judg, Juſtice, Officer or ſubject uſe none of them, becauſe ſome are faulty? Doth that make him guilty of all? *Bonum eſt ex cauſis integris:* The fault of a part may indeed denominate the whole faulty ſo far. But the whole Law or Liturgy may be called faulty for a part, and yet he that uſeth either, not be guilty of any of the bad part, for uſing the good. The Law and Liturgy are one thing, and the uſe is another: Its faults are no further his, than he owneth them; your Bread or Meat may be called bad, if part only be bad, and yet if you eat none but the good part, it will not hurt you.

2. But if it muſt be otherwiſe, no man may hear you, or joyn with your Churches: And do you think (as aforeſaid) that Mr. *Faldo*, and all his Church at *Barnet*, lived not in a ſinful communion very many years, that omitted at leaſt an integral part of publick worſhip, the ſinging of Gods praiſe? Chriſt with his Diſciples ſung a Hymn after the Sacrament. The *Jews* Church made it the chief part of their Worſhip. *James* preſcribeth it us in all our Holy Mirth, ſuch as the Lords Day is appointed for, 1 Cor. 14. 26. *Every one had a Pſalm*, and with them *no one had a Pſalm*, tho

tho his Judgment was for it; the queſtion was, Whether he ſhould forſake them for refuſing it: I thought not, becauſe it was better that they had ſomething that was good, than nothing. But your argument would not only unchurch them, but make all ſinners that communicated with them: for omiſſions of great duties are faults, and greater faults than tolerable failings in performance: He that prayeth not at all, doth worſe than he that prayeth by a Book; and he that preacheth or teacheth not at all, doth worſe than he that readeth a Sermon; ſo that their total ſtated omiſſion and oppoſition to ſinging, by your falſe rule, denominated them *no worſhippers of God*, if the whole muſt be denominated from a part.

How many private Meetings in *London*, never ſing a Pſalm for fear of being diſcovered? Yea, how many ſeldom read a Chapter, but only preach and pray, and ſometime adminiſter the Sacrament? Muſt we needs ſay therefore that they omit all Worſhip?

VI. On ſuch occaſions I argued, That if we muſt not communicate with any Pariſh Church becauſe of the faults of the Liturgy, it will follow, that we muſt not communicate with any Church on Earth that hath as great faults; and that by this we muſt renounce Communion with all Chriſts Body on Earth: All the *Armenians*, *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, *Copties*, *Abaſſines*, *Georgians*, *Greeks*, *Ruſſians*, *Papiſts*, yea *Lutherans*, have a more faulty Liturgie, or manner of worſhip, than the *Engliſh*. Yea the Churches called Calviniſts have their Liturgies and faults: And I inſtanced in *Switzerland*, becauſe as God hath of late moſt preſerved their peace, ſo they are taken to be the honeſteſt ſort of Proteſtants, that in poverty ſerve God with ſoundeſt doctrine, and leaſt ſcandal of Life, but yet have no proper diſcipline but the Magiſtrates? Is it a ſin to have conſederacy or Communion with their Churches?

To this he plainly ſaith Page 11. It is: *That is, all that confederate with them, as Churches, are guilty of their error, called Eraſtian: For ſubjection to ſuch diſcipline is the condition of their Communion.*

Anſ. Subjection is an equivocal word: If it were by profeſſion or ſubſcription of conſent it were indeed to be guilty of that error (tho not by a fault of the Part denominating the whole, to make their worſhip unlawful, or their Churches none) but if by ſubjection you mean but joyning in their Churches as Chriſtian and Proteſtant for doctrine and worſhip, notwithſtanding the defect which they cannot help, yea which they diſclaim, bare accuſation will not prove this a ſin; but by this we ſee how much of Chriſts Church you are for ſeparating from.

2. For my part I have oft publiſhed, That it is not the leaſt part of my charge againſt Popery, that they unchurch almoſt all the Chriſtian World but themſelves: But yet they are about a 4th or 3d part of profeſſed Chriſtians themſelves; and divers of them do not unchurch the *Greeks*;

But to unchurch or forbid Communion with all that are as faulty, as the *Helvetians* and all other Proteſtant Churches that have Liturgies or partial faults, is that which I dare not be guilty of: I think that to ſay, That a thouſand parts to one of Chriſts Church, are none of his Churches, is next to depoſing him from his Kingdom: Much like as it would be to ſay, no part of *London* is the Kings but *Amen Corner*, nor any part of *England* but *Barnet* or *Brentford*.

3. And is it not one of our juſt accuſations of the Papiſts, That they ſay all the Proteſtant Churches are no true Churches, and the Miniſters no true Paſtors; and that Communion with them is unlawful? and ſhall we now juſtifie them and ſay as they (tho not on the ſame Reaſon, but for a far ſmaller difference)? Is this our running from Popery?

4. Yea, is it not the great thing that we accuſe the ſuperconformiſts for? That they make us to be no true Miniſters or Churches? and are we indeed of the ſame mind? One ſide ſaith, We are no true Miniſters for want of Bps. Ordination, &c. Another ſide ſaith, You are no true Miniſters for having Communion with the Biſhops and Churches, *&c.*

VII. I mentioned the Judgment and Practiſe of the old Nonconformiſts and Presbyterians, not as a rule, but as a comparative example. To this he ſaith, p. 11. *You and they might as well own the Church of* England *in the form and conſtitution as it is eſtabliſhed as the Pariſh churches to be particular Goſpel churches*, &c. —— P. 12. *To ſay you join with a quatenus, and own not the very conſtitution and ſtanding of the church, with which you join in the ſame the church aſſerts it, is the greateſt equivocation in practice that is: The old Nonconformiſts nor you are to be no preſidents to us in this caſe —— So far as the old Nonconformiſts, and the old reforming conformiſts went forward with Reformation to bring the church out of the wilderneſs, we honour them; but when they turn back again, and entice the people ſo to do, we are afraid to tempt God in that manner ——* P. 14. *Thoſe old Nonconformiſts that did ſo, are no preſidents to us; If they halted and were lame, muſt we be ſo? ſuch communicants are not acceptable to any Church, and I know what Church would never admit them, were it not to puniſh and expoſe them and their profeſſion, as ridiculous and inconſiſtent with its ſelf: And as for* FRENCH and DUTCH, *what are they to us*, &c. —— P. 16. He calls Mr. *Ferns* joining in the Liturgy with exception of ſome part [*The ſullen practice of a half-paced doting Nonconformiſt.*

Anſ. Firſt to the Cauſe, and ſecondly to the Perſons.

1. To call any practice, *Equivocation*, or by any ill name, is no proof that it is ſo; nor is here a word of true proof given us: I ask the Conſiderate; Is it in the power of a Law-maker, to make all Worſhip and Duty to God unlawful by commanding to do it for an unlawful end, or upon falſe principles? What if a Law ſaid, All people ſhall worſhip God, not becauſe

because the Scripture commandeth it, but because the State commands it? Would this make it unlawful to worship God? I would disown the Principle, and go on.

What if the Law should say, The Pastoral Office is not of Divine Right, but humane, must the office therefore be renounced? And why can such a Law any more bind me to judg of Church-constitutions by the Lawmakers words, rather than by Gods Word?

Suppose that the *Anabaptists* say, That rebaptizing is the true way of Church-gathering: Is it a sin to communicate with them, if they will receive me when I profess the contrary.

I am against the Covenant which you defend, as making an *Independent* Church: Is it therefore a sin to communicate with them, because it is not as constituted by that Covenant?

What do Parties more differ in of late, than Forms, Orders, Modes and Circumstances of Church Government; and if they be of many contrary minds, were it twenty, there can be but one of them in the right: And is it unlawful to join with all the rest? Must we needs be sure which of these is in the right?

Almost all the Churches that I hear of in the world, have their agreed professions published; the Protestants are gathered in the *Corpus confessionum*; the English Church Principles and Orders are expressed in the Book of Canons, the Liturgy, Ordination, the 39 Articles, the Homilies, the Apology, *&c.* Must every one stay from their Churches, till he hath read and understood all these Books, and be sure that there is no fault or error in them? What if it be poor men or women that cannot buy all these books? and what if they cannot read? whom shall they get to read them all? and how shall they have time to study them, or capacity to understand them, when we can hardly get them to learn a Catechism and anderstand it?

You will say, That is their crime that make all these Confessions and Books: They will answer, but that's none of our fault: We made them not, and yet must we not communicate with any Church that maketh such? The old Separatists, called *Brownists*, published their confession, and therein owned many Parish Churches in *England*, and Communion with them: I recited their words in my Reasons, *&c.* But you are gone beyond them: The *New-England* churches printed their confession, and all there agreed not to it: The English *Independents* published their Principles and Confessions: And the *Presbyterians* and they agreed in the *Westminster* Synods confession, catechism and Directory: Is every poor Man and Woman bound to stay from all their

churches, (when for 14 years they had no other) till they understand all these, and know that they are faultless? Or if there be any fault in any one of all these books, is every one guilty of them that cometh to the churches?

The *Anabaptists* published their confession; The *Dutch* have theirs: Many churches agreed with them in the Synod of *Dort*. The *French* have theirs; the *Saxons*, the *Helvetians*, *Geneva*, the *Bohemians*, the *Protestants* in general had the *Augustane*, and many more have theirs. Reader, See with whom these Writers will hold communion, who make it unlawful to join with any church that have any fault in their constitutions, or agreed Doctrines or Orders.

Let us rise upward, till we come to the Apostles days: None of all these churches named, dare profess all their agreements and confession to be without fault, that ever I heard of, except the *English*, who bind Ministers to assent and consent to all things commanded and prescribed in three Books, and excommunicate those that say their Books or Ceremonies and Government hath any thing contrary to the Word of God; but no Lay-man is bound to believe them; *Wickliffe*, and *John Hus*, the *Waldenses*, and the *Bohemians* Confessions, are not faultless: Of the *Papist*, and the *Socinians*, we will make no question; the forenamed churches of *Greeks*, *Russians*, *Armenians*, *Abassines*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, &c. are, alas past question faulty: the general councils upward from that of *Trent*, *Basil*, *Constance*, &c. to the six first, yea, the four first, which some equal to the four Gospels, are far from being faultless in the Judgment of these Objectors, and of my self: the *Arrian* and other heretical councils are past question; even that of *Nice*, the first and best, I suppose he and I think did not well in setling church-power as they did, and forbidding all kneeling on the Lords days, in Adoration, and other the like: The *Donatists* and the *Novatians*, called the *Puritans* of those times, had faulty agreements; were it but for Bps. and Arch-Bps. he will think them so: this Writer can name no one church on the face of the Earth Orthodox or heretical (tho *Aerius* called *Presbyters* equal with Bps.) that was not for Bishops over *Presbyters* from the year 100 after Christ, till the Reformation, that ever I could read of: Yea, consider whether they were not in the Apostles days, when *Jerome*, who most depresseth this degree, saith, That there were such at *Alexandria* chosen by the Presbyters from the days of *Mark*: and *Mark* died long before *John* the Apostle: But Episcopacy is not all: Not only *Epiphanius* but all Church History that speaketh of such matters, agreeth, that (besides the croud of latter Ceremonies)

monies) there were certain ceremonies called the *cuſtomes of the Univerſal Church*, which all the known Churches agreed in, (even thoſe that differ'd about *Eaſter-day*, and other ſuch) that is, 1. Cloathing the Baptized in white Garments. 2. Giving them milk and hony to taſt. 3. Anointing them with Oyl. 4. Not kneeling in adoration on any Lords day, or any other day between *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday*. There is no notice when theſe began, ſo ancient were they, nor of any one Church or Chriſtian that refuſed them; but they were commonly called the Traditions Apoſtolical, or cuſtomes of the Univerſal Church.

Now I agree with this Author, that theſe things were indeed a deviation from the Apoſtles practice, and ought not to have been thus uſed: But the queſtion is, whether every Chriſtian was guilty of the fault that had communion with any of theſe churches? and whether had he then lived, he ſhould have ſeparated from all the Churches on earth?

By this you ſee, that this opinion muſt needs make men ſeekers, who ſay, that the church was in the wilderneſs, and loſt all true Miniſtry, (and, ſay they, particular churches, and Scripture) after the firſt (or at moſt the ſecond) century: and ſo that for fourteen hundred years Chriſt had no viſible Kingdom on earth: And conſequently, that we have no wiſer anſwer to the Papiſt [*where was your church before Luther*] than to ſay that it was *Inviſible*; that is, that we cannot prove that there was any ſuch thing on Earth; and conſequently, that we cannot prove that Chriſt had any Kingdom on earth, and was its King; that is, whether there was any Chriſt in actual church-adminiſtration? And doth ſeparating from the whole viſible church-communion agree with the propheſies and precepts of union? Was this church like a grain of Muſtard ſeed in its growth? Was all the wonderful works of redemption wrought for no viſible ſociety after one or two hundred years, in which a few perſecuted ones were viſible? Is not this the next ſtep (and a temptation) to utter infidelity? If Chriſt have now no viſible church on earth, but the people called *Browniſts* or *Separatiſts*, doth it anſwer the Scripture deſcription of him and his church? And is it not expoſing chriſtianity to the ſcorn of infidels, ſo to ſay? Would not almoſt all rather turn Papiſts, than believe this? And be rather of their church, than of none.

2. But let us next ſpeak of the perſons. I may ſpeak my thoughts without impoſing on you. I think that the Major vote is no rule to the Minor, nor always is in the right. If a hundred men that underſtand

ſtand not *Greek* or *Hebrew*, Tranſlate a Text one way, and a good Linguiſt another way, I will more ſuſpect their judgment than his. And ſo in the like caſe. But if I hear a few odd perſons condemn the judgment of the generality that are far better acquainted with matters of the ſame nature, [as if School-boys that are but in their *Accidence*, ſhould oppoſe all the upper Forms in expounding *Horace*, or *Heſiod*, or *Homer*] which, think you, ſhould I moſt ſuſpect?— I ſay again to you, compare the writings of *Bucer*, *Peter Martyr*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Melanchton*, *Chamier*, *Blondel*, *Dailee*, and a bundance ſuch; and alſo *Greenham*, *Perkins*, Dr. *John Reignolds*, *Cartwrights*, *Dods*, *Hilderſhams*, *Hieron: Ameſius's*, *Baynes*, *Rollocks*, and many ſuch, yea with ſuch conformiſts as *Jewels*, Bp. *Downames*, *John Downames*, *Davenants*, *Bp. Halls*, *Arch-Bp. Uſhers*, *Bp. Rob. Abbots*, *Dr. Fields*, *Dr. Challoners*, *Dr. Airys*, &c. I ſay, compare theſe with the Theological writings of *Mr. Perry*, *Mr. Can*, and all other called ſeparatiſts or *Browniſts* in their times, and tell me whether theſe later did manifeſt more Holy Wiſdom in Heavenly things, more skill in all other points of Divinity, than the former: If their writings (giving Mr. *Ainſworth* his due honour in *Hebrew* and Piety) were as far below the other, as the lower forms of ſchool-boys are beneath the higheſt, which ſhould we moſt ſuſpect to have had the greater or the leſſer light, ſpecially when the lower condemn and cut off themſelves from communion with all Chriſts known Churches on earth for thirteen hundread years. When Mr. *Smith* (and lately a very good man here) thought none fit to Baptize him again, but Baptized himſelf; was not that ſingularity a juſt cauſe of ſuſpicion? Yet I make not the old Nonconformiſts your rule.

VIII. I argued alſo, from the common frailties of us all, that it will be unlawful to communicate with any Church on earth, even with thoſe of the objectors mind, if we are guilty of the ſins in Doctrine, worſhip and diſcipline, of all Churches that we communicate with. I will aggravate none, nor render that odious which God accepteth: My work is to confute thoſe that do ſo. But I ſay, that 1. we have all many errors; And men uſe to put their errors into their prayers and preaching 2. Do not men uſe to deliberate more, and ſtudy what to write, than what to preach? And have men reaſon to be confident that our preaching will be more ſounder than our writing? This Author exclaims againſt me, as Popiſh, Arminian, for Juſtification by works, for merit, &c. May it not be expected that I preach as bad as I write? And is it not then a ſin to be my hearer? Can I think that

that he will not preach as ill as he writeth in this book? And are all ſinners therefore for hearing him? I promiſe him that if I know of any Pariſh Miniſter that will uſually preach with as much error, reflexion and gall as he here writeth, I will be none of that mans hearers, or uſual Communicants.

But to this he ſaith, P. 19. *We diſtinguiſh between the rule of worſhip, and the adminiſtration and performance:* ——— 1. *It is not ſins of ordinary infirmity.* 2. *Nor ſins not foreknown, ſo as to prevent joining with them, but them that worſhip God by a falſe rule*, &c.

Anſ. 1. This is the great ſtrength of all his Book, That we ſin by a falſe rule, but they ſin only againſt a true rule; but I think nothing is ſin indeed, but that which is againſt a true rule, even Gods word; making and uſing a falſe rule, is therefore ſin, becauſe it is againſt the true rule. Moſt hypocrites are ſuppoſed to own a true rule while they are falſe to it, and ſin againſt it. To ſin againſt knowledge, and an acknowledged rule, is an aggravation of the ſin, and ſuch ſhall be beaten with many ſtripes: *Paul* opens it to the *Jews*, Rom. 2. at large, therefore this will not excuſe our communion with ſuch.

2. This Reaſon croſſeth the buſineſs of the opponent; for whereas the greateſt reaſon againſt Communion with Pariſh Churches is the badneſs of the Communicants, and Miniſters lives; theſe are not the obeying of the Law or Canons, but diſobeying them: The Law, called the Rule, bids no man ſwear raſhly, lye, be drunk, unclean, ſlander, rail, &c. Nay it commandeth the Miniſter to deny the Sacrament to ſuch: Ignorance, unbelief, hypocriſie, are not commanded, but forbidden by that Rule: Miniſters break the rule, if they preach error, or hereſie, or againſt Love and Peace, and promote not Godlineſs, and mens ſalvation, with all holy diligence, by Doctrine and Life; ſo that no ſins againſt this is cauſe of ſeparation, if it be only uſing a falſe rule that is, juſt cauſe.

3. But what is the falſe Rule? The word *Rule* maketh all this excuſe and accuſation of his a meer equivocation: In general, a *rule* is any thing to which we purpoſely conform our actions, that they may be right: Of this there are divers ſorts.

1. The Primary Rule is the abſolute Law of God, to which all mens actions ſhould be conformed.

2. Subordinate humane Rules: Theſe are of divers ſorts. 1. The obliging commands of Authority. 1. Of Magiſtrates. 2. Paſtors. 3. Parents and Maſters of Families. 4. School-Maſters and Tutors of

of Youth, &c. 2. Contracts or Agreements of men for concord.

1. Gods Law is never a falſe rule, but an erring Expoſitor may make the words the matter of a falſe rule by putting on them a falſe ſenſe.

2. Juſt ſubordinate rules are not falſe, juſtly uſed. 1. Magiſtrates rule either by *common Laws*, or temporary and particular Mandates, both being obligatory to duty, and indeed but ſeveral ſorts of Laws, while they uſe but that authority which God gave them. Laws or Mandates are juſt rules.

2. Paſtors can make duty by ruling-authority for none but the Flocks committed to them: They may command what God authorizeth them to command; whether it be by word or writing, is all one: And whether you will call it a Law or not, the name altereth not the caſe: Tho indeed in the general notion, all is true law, which authoritatively by command maketh a ſubjects duty. Its a true rule when the Ruler goeth not beyond his authority. *Heb.* 13. 7, 17, 24. 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 12, 17, &c.

3. The ſame muſt be ſaid of Parents, Maſters, Tutors, &c.

4. Agreements or contracts are rules made for Concord by the ſelf-governing power that all men have over themſelves: and they are juſt rules when juſtly uſed.

5. Beſides all theſe, moſt make a mans own reaſon, judgment or conſcience, the immediate ſubordinate rule of his actions. Indeed it is more fitly called the diſcerner of his rule and duty, as the eye is to the body: For it maketh not duty, but diſcerneth it made: But if any will call the *Underſtanding a Rule* to the *Will*, inſtead of a *Guide*, we may bear with the impropriety. All this is clear truth.

Now the queſtion is, how any of theſe ſubordinate rules are *juſt* or *falſe*?

1. Two things God hath not only allowed, but commanded them all to do about Religion. 1. To command ſubjects as Gods officers to obey Gods Laws, and in juſt caſes to puniſh the breakers of them, in matters within their juriſdiction. And to do this by Laws, Mandates, Judgment and Execution. 2. To make ſubordinate Mandates or Laws for determining ſuch Circumſtances as God hath commanded them to determine, by the General Law of Governing or Ruling, and of doing all to unity, concord, edification, peace, order, and decency. Theſe things Chriſtian Magiſtrates may do Nationally. Paſtors to their Flocks, Maſters to their Families and Scholars; and

equals

equals (Paſtors and People) may make fit agreements where they are free:

And theſe rules may be called *falſe* or *true*, in ſeveral degrees.

1. It's groſs falſood and uſurpation, to ſet up an office forbidden of God, and falſe in its very nature.

2. It's next in degree falſe, for men of an office of Gods inſtitution, to command things utterly out of their calling and juriſdiction, in which they have no power from God mediately or immediately. Conſcience binds none to formal obedience (*propter authoritatem imperantis*) to either of theſe; tho material obedience, and non-reſiſtance, may be duties.

The lower degree, is when the office is of God, and the matter is in their power, and not only belonging *ad alienum forum*; But they *miſdetermine* it in the manner, not uſurping anothers office, but doing their own amiſs: Tho herein conſcience is not bound to obedience; *ratio materiæ ſub ratione indebiti modi*; yet if the matter be not forbidden of God, obedience may be a duty herein, *ſub ratione medii*, neceſſary to ſeveral ends; that is, *to concord, to honour the governor, to avoid offence, and to avoid greater hurt to the Church, others, or our ſelves.*

But if the thing commanded be forbidden of God, no man muſt do it. But divers things commanded unlawfully in the manner, may become duties by that command, becauſe they be made thereby needful means of Unity, Peace, Honour to Rulers, *&c.* as aforeſaid, which elſe would have been ſin (as to meet at an inconvenient time or place, to uſe a Tranſlation, metre, *&c.* leſs fit.)

Now all theſe being ſubordinate rules, they bind only ſubordinately by virtue of Gods ſupreme rule, who made them rulers (and he is no ruler that can give no rule); even as corporation By-Laws bind only by vertue of the Soveraigns higher Law.

And tho this Author would be the Ruler of Language ſo far, as to ſay that all *ſinful Worſhip is not falſe Worſhip*, they that uſe words, as greater Maſters have long ſtated the ſence, do know, that the falſeneſs is the diſconformity to Gods ſupream Rule, and that may be in all the degrees forementioned: And Rules or Worſhip are both falſe ſo far as they are diſconform to the Law of God.

And now wherein is our Rule, falſe and theirs true? 1. We own no Rule of direct immediate obedience to God, nor of any univerſal or unchangeable duty to God, but what his Law (of Nature, or ſuper-

natural) doth make us. We hold that no man hath power to alter Gods word, to command any thing againſt it, nor any thing which God hath appropriated to himſelf, as to make new conditions of ſalvation, new Sacraments, new Laws, as Gods, or new duties for themſelves, neceſſary to Salvation; no, nor any thing but what Gods own General Law doth command or allow them to determine, being left by him undetermined, to their Power and Rule.

We hold that if any Ruler go contrary to, and beyond thoſe Rules of God, it is their ſin, and not ours, and we openly diſown it: And ſo do our Rulers in general themſelves moſt expreſly in the Books of Articles, Ordination, Homilies, Apology, *&c.* Binding all Miniſters to the Scripture for the Rule of their Preaching and Living, only infallible, ſufficient in all things neceſſary to Salvation; and that if Councils, or any men err or diſagree with Scripture, they are not to be followed.

We openly renounce all falſe Rules, and Canons; but if for ſuch ſin againſt their own profeſſion of Scripture-ſufficiency, we muſt renounce Communion with all that are guilty, we ſcarce know the Church on Earth which we muſt not renounce. And the opponents in Particular.

2. For let us try now whether you have no Rule which you call *Falſe*, as well as falſe or ſinful practice. But I will firſt take in his fuller explication, leſt I miſtake him.

IX. Page 37. *I roundly aſſert againſt you, That tho every Church of Chriſt hath the liberty aad priviledge to act prudentially, or make prudential determinations concerning the preſent uſe of indifferent things* pro hic & nunc, *yet to make any ſtanding or binding determination and Laws for themſelves or other, is altogether unlawful, as highly derogatory to the Kingly office of Chriſt, and robbing themſelves or others of their granted priviledge, and ſo a forfeiture of their Charter: And ſo all your by-ſtanding laws and ſubordinate Laws for worſhip which you talk of, are unwarrantable additions to the word of God.*

Anſ. 1. This indeed is *round aſſreting*; but your word is no proof, and here is no better.

Contrarily, 1. Thoſe whom Chriſt maketh Rulers of his Church, and commandeth to do all things, not particularly determined by him, as ſhall conduce to peace, concord, order, decency, and edification, may Rule accordingly by ſuch determinations.

But ſome ſuch there are whom Chriſt maketh Rulers of his Church *&c.* ergo, *&c.*

Maj. Prob. Matth. 24. *Who then is a faithful and wiſe Servant, whom the Lord hath made ruler over his houſhold to give them meat in due ſeaſon,* &c.

1 Theſ. 5. 12. *Know them who are among you, and are over you in the Lord,* &c.

1 *Cor.* 4. 12. Let a man ſo account of us, as of the Miniſters of Chriſt, and Stewards of the myſteries of God, *&c.*

Heb. 13. 7, 17. 24. Remember them *who have the Rule over you,* &c. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves, for they watch for your ſouls, as they that muſt give account,* &c. *Salute all that have the rule over you,* &c.

1 Tim. 5. 17. *The Elders that rule well are worthy of double honour.*

1 Cor. 14. 26. *Let all things be done to edifying.* 4. *Let all things be done decently and in order.* 33. *God is not the author of confuſion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the Saints.*

By all this, it is evident that Church Rulers there muſt be; and ſuch ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles in the ordinary parts of their office as Chriſt will be with to the end of the World, *Matth.* 28. 20. And alſo in what their Rule conſiſteth.

Now to the queſtion of *Impoſing*: (I premiſe, that tho this uſurper of a Magiſtry in Language will have *Impoſing* taken ſtill in an ill ſenſe; I leave that to him, it is enough for me to tell him that I take it according to the prime ſignification [*to put a thing on others*] without reſpect to well or ill doing it.)

1. I know not whether by *every Church*, he intend a meer voting body of People and Paſtors by conſent, or the Paſtors alone as the Rulers of a voluntary People.

2. I know not whether he take [*prudential determinations*] as diſtinct from *Governing Obligations*, or not.

3. I know not whether by [*preſent uſe*] he mean it only for *one preſent meeting*, or for more, and for how many and how long: And [*by ſtanding*] how long he meaneth.

I grant to him that no man may make *univerſal* or *unchangeable* Laws, but temporal and mutable, and only for his own ſubjects. But I maintain,

1. That Paſtors may by word or writing make binding commands

or determinations to their Flocks of the foresaid modes and circumstances of Religion and Worship. For 1. They are such as are necessary *in genere*, and the determination to this or that sort disjunctively necessary: Somebody must determine them (and that for more than the present meeting, even statedly): And it belongs to the Rulers office to do it: None else is fit or hath any other power, than by contract.

I have oft enough instanced in particulars. It is not meet that every meeting the People be put to Vote where to meet next: And there is no certainty that they will agree; but some be for one place, and some for another: An ordinary capacious place is necessary: It is the Rulers office to appoint it. It's no sin against Christ for him to require them to come to the same place, from year to year, while it is fit.

2. The same I say for a commanding determination of the Lecture-days, or times of meeting, which the Pastor may prescribe statedly by his office, without the Peoples votes.

Or if all such things were imposed by a Major Vote on the Minor, their Vote would be a Governing Rule to the Minor part.

3. While Praying with the Hatt on, is by the custom of the country a sign of unreverence, the Pastors (or Elders that Rule well) may command the Flocks by their authority, ordinarily, and not at the present only, to be uncovered at Prayer and Sacrament in the assembly, without wronging Christs Power, unless obeying it be wronging it.

The same I say of usual kneeling at Prayer.

5. If the Congregation be called to confess their Faith, or renew their Covenant with God, the Rulers may command all that consent, to signifie it by such a sign, as standing, or lifting up the hand, or subscribing, *&c.* And they are bound to obey them.

6. I have oft enough instanced in Translations, Metres, Tunes, Utensils, Ornaments, and many such like.

Obj. *The Pastors make no Laws.* *Ans.* Dally not with names: Any thing is a Law which ruling authority maketh duty: If Writing it, maketh a Law, they may write it: But a verbal Mandate is one species of a Law: And imposeth and determineth, and obligeth to obedience; and it is sin to disobey, because God commandeth them to obey, *Heb.* 13. 17. And even by the 5th Commandment.

It

It doth as truly limit, and oblige when Paſtors command, as when Magiſtrates do it, tho they force not by the Sword.

Obj. *But theſe are but natural circumſtances, and belong no more to worſhip, than to any other things.*

Anſ. It's a ſad thought to me to think how many ſeem ſatisfied with ſuch an anſwer as this. All ſubſtances have their accidents, quality, time, place, *&c.* But yet the accident of one ſubſtance is not the accident of another; The quantity and quality of a man is not the quantity and quality of a Toad, *&c.* When theſe accidents are adjoyned to worſhip, they be not accidents of other things. Is *Speaking* no part nor accident of worſhip, becauſe ſpeaking is uſed in common things?

Kneeling is uſed in other caſes: But kneeling in prayer to expreſs reverence, is not common to other things.

Putting off the hat ſheweth Reverence to a Prince: But to be uncovered at Prayer or Sacrament is the Accident at leaſt of that Worſhip, and not of other things: Metre and Tunes belong to Ballads: But the Metre and Tune of Pſalms doth not, but is appropriate to thoſe Pſalms.

Time and Place belong to all natural actions: But the Time and Place ſeparated to Gods Worſhip is an accident only of that.

It is not the natural ſpecification of an act or circumſtance, or the generical nature that we ſpeak of; but the individual accident or circumſtance as appropriate to a religious work.

Is love to God no worſhip, becauſe love is a natural act? Is praying no act of Religion, becauſe we may pray to men? Is eating and drinking no part of the Sacrament, becauſe we uſe them as natural acts for our daily ſuſtenance? Is waſhing no part of Baptiſm, becauſe we waſh at other times: Thinking is a natural act, but holy thinking is more: Were *Davids* ſorts of Muſick no part or accident of Worſhip, becauſe Muſick is natural or artificial?

It magnifieth theſe acts to be applied to worſhip, and it is a commendation of Worſhip-Ordinances that they are ſuited to nature, and advance and ſanctifie it.

Now at laſt I come cloſer to my queſtion: Have you no Church Rulers among you? No Elders that rule well? Is it unlawful to communicate with you, if thoſe Elders by Mandates which are obligatory to the flock do preſcribe Days, and Hours, Temples, or publick places for

for ordinary Worſhip, and if they command you to uſe the new Tranſlation rather than the *Geneva*, publickly, or preſcribe the ſame Metre and Tunes, rather than your Congregation ſhall ſing, ſome one Pſalm, and ſome another: Or if they command them to be uncovered at Sacrament and Prayer, or to kneel at prayer? *&c.* If you take this power from the Paſtors, and will ſeparate from them for ſuch obliging Laws or Mandates, you do that very thing which you fiercely talk againſt; you deſtroy or reſiſt Chriſts Kingly Government by his Officers

Oh what is Man! What are the beſt of Men! What doth the Church and World ſuffer by them! The ſame men that cry up Chriſts Kingdom, call it rebellion againſt him to obey his Officers: As if we muſt depoſe or diſobey the King, unleſs we diſobey all his Judges, Juſtices and Officers.

All the obligatory deciſions that the Apoſtles made about their Love Feaſts, anointing the ſick, the Kiſs of Love, long Hair, covering or uncovering, order of prophecying, and of collections, &c. were not ſtanding Laws to us; nor done by uncommunicable power; but were temporary Laws, and local, and ſuch as their Succeſſors, when fit, may make.

If you have no ſuch Rulers in your Churches, you ſhould queſtion whether your Churches have the true order of Paſtors, as well as you queſtion the Pariſh Miniſters: Do they not want ruling power, as well as theirs; ſpecially if *you* deny the very *power*, and *they* be but hindred in the exerciſe.

Obj. But ſome may be forced to ſay, *Our Paſtors do nothing, but by the peoples conſent.*

Anſ. They are their Paſtors by conſent, and rule them as voluntary, and not by force: But their rule and precepts are never leſs obligatory on Conſcience by vertue of Gods command to obey them: Muſt they preſcribe none of the things forementioned, till all have voted it, or conſented? They muſt command them to conſent, and they ſin if they diſobey, tho they can force none to obey.

Object. But ſome may be driven to ſay, *We allow ſuch preſcribing power to Paſtors, but not to Magiſtrates.*

Anſ. 1. What Power the Kings of *Judah* uſed in Worſhip, *David, Solomon, Aſa, Jehoſaphet, Hezekiah, Joſiah*, I need not tell.

2. Chriſt came not to put down Kings, but to ſanctifie their office: All

All power is given him: By him Kings reign: The Kingdoms of the world are his by right: Rulers are his Miniſters for our good: They muſt puniſh evil doers, and promote well doing: He commands us to honour and obey them; They are keepers of both Tables: They may drive Miniſters to their duty, and puniſh them for mal-adminiſtration: Tho they may uſurp nothing proper to the paſtoral office, nor forbid them any ſuch thing, yet ſuch circumſtances as belong to the nation, or to many Churches, and not to this or that in peculiar, the Magiſtrates may determine: It is of great uſe, that all the approved Churches in a Nation, ſignifie their conſent in the ſame Confeſſion of Faith, the ſame anniverſary days of Humiliation and Thanksgiving (as is done about the Powder Plot) and the ſame Tranſlation of the Scripture, if not alſo the ſame Pſalm Books; God ſtrictly commandeth Concord, and to ſerve him with one mind and mouth, and to avoid confuſion, and diviſion, and diſcord: What reaſon can any man give why Chriſts Officers appointed to rule by the ſword, may not thus diſcharge their truſt? Shall we ſin if the Law impoſe a Tranſlation, Pſalm Book, or reverent geſture, unleſs we ſeparate? Is commanded obedience become a ſin? And yet not if a Paſtor or a ruling Majority of people injoin it, or unleſs we leave all to confuſion?

X. Here therefore I utterly renounce the opinion that ſhall hold that ſuch things being lawful when uncommanded, become unlawful when commanded by ſuch as in Miniſtry, Magiſtracy, or Families, or Schools, are Rulers: Yea, if the Ruler miſdo his work, the ſin is his; I muſt not ſeparate from every Kingdom, Church, or Family that is ill governed: Nor am I diſcharged from obedience in *lawful* things by the addition of ſome unlawful commands that deſtroy not acceptable Worſhip, and turn not our food to Poyſon: I tell thoſe Miniſters that publickly charge this on Nonconformiſts, that they muſt not charge any Doctrine of Seekers or Anabaptiſts, or ſuch ſeparatiſts, to be the Nonconformiſts Doctrine: I know not one meer Nonconformiſt of that mind: What we of this Age thought of Epiſcopacy, Liturgy, and Magiſtracy, all that would come in and own that cauſe openly with us, have told the world in our publiſhed Propoſals of 1660 and 1661: To which we refer them that would know their minds.

XI. But when I oft alledged the example of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, this Objector and Anſwerer ſaith, p. 19. *We make not Chriſt and his Apoſtles Hypocrites; for we have proved, that Chriſt never joined with falſe worſhip, ſo much as with his preſence at the place of it, unleſs with this intent, to bear witneſs againſt it; nor did he ever adviſe his diſciples ſo to*

do:

Ob: As for Moſes Chair, it was then Chriſts own Inſtitution, and he had then no other Church or Inſtitution on earth.

Anſ. It was cautelouſly done to paſs by the inſtances of the Apoſtles that neither ſeparated, nor commanded one man to ſeparate from all the faulty Churches, *Rev.* 2. 3. Notwithſtanding the Woman *Jezabels* Doctrine, and that of the *Nicolaitans*, which God hated, and the evil practices; nor from the Church of *Corinth*, where were carnal Schiſms, Defraudings, Lawſuits before Heathens, inceſt unlamented, Sacrament diſorders, even to exceſs of drink, diſorder in Church Worſhip, *&c.* Nor from any other faulty Churches.

Meth'nks they that are ſo ſtrict againſt any additions in Modes of Worſhip, ſhould not ſo much add or alter Scripture, or accuſe it of defectiveneſs, as to ſuppoſe the Apoſtles to have culpably communicated with ſuch Churches, as *Corinth*, *Coloſs*, *Epheſus*, *Sardis*, *Laodicea*, *Smyrna*, &c. yea and with the *Jews*, who by falſifying the Rules, called it unlawful to eat with the *Gentiles*, or to eat what *Moſes* Law forbad, and not to keep their days: *Pauls* accompliſhing of his Vow in the Temple, and becoming a *Jew* to the *Jews*, was fully contrary to the opponents Doctrine.

And as to Chriſts practice; we ſaid before you, that he conformed not to any evil, nor ſhould you. But did he not ſend the Lepers to a falſe ill-called corrupt ſort of Prieſts, to do by, and with them, what the Law required? Did he not ordinarily joyn in the Synagogues in their worſhip? Could he have leave conſtantly to teach there, if he had there uſed to cry down their ordinary worſhip? Had the Ceremonious Phariſees no ill forms nor ceremonies in their Worſhip? Again, I ſay, Their long Prayers which were the Cloak of their oppreſſion, were either extemporate, or forms of Liturgy. If extemporate, then the worſt of Hypocrites may conſtantly uſe long extemporate Prayers, and it had been no injury to the Spirit in them, to have perſwaded them to uſe Chriſts form inſtead of them.

If they were Liturgies, then Chriſt did not ſeparate from ſuch; no nor reprove them at all, when he reproveth the hypocritical abuſe of them: Yea, ſeemeth to commend them, while he nameth them, as a Cloak to cover evil, which nothing is fit for, that is not good.

Obj. *He had no other Church?* *Anſ.* 1. Then moſt in *England* may go to the Pariſh Churches, where they have no other Church to go to. 2. But Chriſt had twelve Apoſtles, and 70, or 72 other Teachers, and many more Diſciples; Were theſe no Church, nor matter for a Church?

XII.

XII. Obj. Page 4. *God hath not left it in our power to communicate with any society, when they make that the condition of my Communion, which I am convinced of to be sin to me, that I question whether it be lawful or no,* &c.

Anſ. How oft have I anſwered this, without any reply? 1. If they make your conſent to any ſin, the condition of your Communion, you muſt avoid it: But if they put no ſin on you, to be preſent when they ſin, is a condition to all Church Communion, and to your own praying, who ſin in all your ſelf; you before excepted ſins of ordinary infirmity, as not warranting ſeparation: And when did you ever prove that the compoſing and impoſing of the Liturgy, (much more the Obedient uſe of the Lords-day part) is not a ſin of infirmity, as much as ſlandering it and the Churches, and writing ſuch Books as yours? Accuſing is not proving.

2. If your taking it for ſin be true, you muſt forbear it: If you *miſtake* it for ſin, which is duty, (*per ſe* or *per accidens*) you ſin againſt God, and truth, by your miſtake, and by your Omiſſion. God bindeth you to alter your Judgment; and ſo he doth, if you take an indifferent thing for ſin, tho here it is ſafeſt to forbear. An erring Conſcience is no Lawmaker (leſs then a Magiſtrate), but a miſconceiver, and doth, *ligare non obligare.*

XIII. Obj. *But none of the things are indeed Worſhip, which you ſay men may command?*

Anſ. That man ſhall be none of my guide, that makes queſtions of bare names to *ſeem to the people, as if they were about the matter named.* [They are ſuch accidents of the Worſhip, which God himſelf commandeth, as are done in the outward expreſſion of reverence and honour to God, and the more decent and edifying performance of his own Inſtitutions.] This is the deſcription of them, (Kneeling, being uncovered, ſwearing with outward ſigns, ſinging in Tunes, Metre, *&c.*). Agree to the thing, and call theſe *Worſhip* or no *Worſhip*, as you pleaſe. You ſay, *Falſe Worſhip* is no *Worſhip*; If ſo, it is no bad Worſhip; but all faulty Worſhip is not null.

XIV. As for his general talk of me, how much I have promoted Popery, and being for Juſtification by works, and merit, *&c.* I give him leave to eaſe his Stomach without an Anſwer, and all thoſe to be deceived by him that will take his word, and not read mine; eſpecially, my Treatiſe of imputed Righteouſneſs.

Page 9. He ſaith, *When the Scripture ſpeaks of juſtification by faith: Doth any ſound Divine or Chriſtians underſtand it of the act of believing, but that its the object of faith that juſtifieth?*

Anſ. See how ſtrictly theſe men ſtick to Scripture, that will have it the ſole Law of Circumſtances, and yet can deny it, as Expoſitors, at their pleaſure; when *Paul* over and over ſo often ſaith, *That we are juſtified by faith, and faith is imputed for righteouſneſs*; and Chriſt ſaith, *Thy faith hath ſaved thee.* It is not faith that they mean, but Chriſt. *It is faith in Chriſt.* There is no faith, but the act or habit of believing, Rom 3. 21. *The righteouſneſs of God, which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt, on all that believe.* 25. *Through faith in his blood.* 26. *The juſtifier of him which believeth in Jeſus*: Many ways ſuch will be odiouſly perverted, if you put Chriſt inſtead of Faith; we are juſtified by no meritorious cauſe, but Chriſts righteouſneſs: but that righteouſneſs juſtifieth not Infidels, nor any but qualified Receivers; and Faith is that qualification. Is not this true? And is it not enough? If you would preach or write cenſurious diſputes, whether it be the *Phyſitian*, or the *Medicine*, or the Patients taking it, that cureth him; or the *Meat*, or the *Giver*, or the eating it, that feedeth men, take your courſe: I had rather anſwer that, and moſt of your Books with groans and tears, than with diſputing.

XV. As for his threatning to open my faults as faſt as I diſcover them, I may ſave him the labour, and lament them my ſelf. Two I will confeſs now, beſides all heretofore.

1. I fear I did ſometime by connivence, and by too oft preaching againſt the faults of the Biſhops about 1640, encourage ſome that were ſet upon accuſing and ſeparating, over much. Tho I ever diſliked and oppoſed that Spirit, and foreſaw what Diviſions and Sins attended.

2. Tho, when I took the League and Covenant, it was not impoſed, but offered to Volunteers, (and I never gave it but to one, and kept the Countrie from taking it); yet ſeeing now, what I ſaw not then, I repent that I took it. (Tho being taken, I dare not ſay that it bindeth not as a ſecondary Self-Obligation to that which God bound me to before.)

My reaſons are; 1. Becauſe, as after impoſed, no knowing man can believe that the thouſands of ignorant people that took it, who never underſtood the controverſies of Prelacy, could take it in Truth, Judgment, and Righteouſneſs, and ſo muſt ſin.

2. Becauſe it cut the Nation in two parts, on pretence of Union, and engaged us againſt ſuch excellent Perſons, as *Uſher*, *Davenant*, and againſt the greateſt half of the Land, when we ſhould have united on the terms of the Baptiſmal Covenant.

3. Becauſe, being before by God and our Allegiance ſufficiently obliged to the King, by a further Vow of mens own making againſt his

his will, they entangled the consciences of the people about the meaning and the obligation of it; some thinking it bound them not to him; and other, that it bound them to fight for him, and yet to oppose the Prelacy that he was for. And now the Law for Corporations binds men to declare that there is no obligation at all from that Oath (either for the King, or against any sin).

XVI. 'There are also more than one of my Opponents, who tell me, 'That because I live in prosperity my self, and suffer not, therefore I am 'insensible of the case of sufferers, and add affliction to the afflicted, and 'have not due compassion on them.

Anſ. If this be true, it is a great sin. But 1. why do the same men accuse me for perswading men to avoid sufferings, as they think, by ill means? It is indeed to save men from suffering by mistake for that which was their duty, to the injury of others, and to reserve their patience for better uses, being like enough to have need of it all.

2. I thank God I am so far from being insensible of the sufferings of the church of Christ throughout the world, that I may say with *Paul*, *Rom.* 9. 1. I have continual sorrow in my heart for the wars, blood, cruelties exercised on them, and much more for their own sin. And sure all the wrath that is against me for labouring to save this Land from division, self-destroying and suffering, 1661. and since, might have been avoided, had I been so self-saving as the accusers feign me.

3. I thank God my sufferings have been far less than I expected or deserved of God, and not worthy to be called sufferings in comparison of thousands in foreign Lands. And I humbly thank the King that they have been no greater; but if they had, all had been now almost at an end. I am not willing to name them, lest it seem to savour of impatience, but remembring *Pauls* example to such accusers (to the *Corinthians*) I will briefly say, 1. From 1630. to 1660. I suffered more assaults and opposition than some of them, by divers penalties for divers duties against iniquity.

2. I think I was the first silenced since the bishops return. And the hot displeasure against me for my pacificatory labour 1660. and 1661. is not unknown.

3. Enquire whether there be more virulent and voluminous accusations printed against me, or any one of them.

4. I have had no Pastoral maintenance these 23. years, and no Church to maintain me, nor any stipendary Lecture; and for about 15. years I received no gift of money from any, but one man, which I could not without incivility refuse.

5. When I went twice a day to their Church at *Acton*, I was sent to the common Gaol (accused for a Sermon for meekness and obedience, and submission to Government) and when I built a Chappel, it cost me about 70 l. to get a Minister out of the prison (that had formerly been imprisoned for the Kings service) for preaching but one Sermon there, when I was twenty miles off.

6. All that I had, was distrained on, and taken from me, all my books, and the very bed I lay on, for preaching after (though, *bona fide*, they had been on just considerations given, or made over to another, and were not mine, but the present use of them only reserved to me) and this by many warrants, as convict by the oaths of I know not whom, nor when, nor could ever know my accuser or witness, nor was ever summoned to speak for my self, much less to examine the witnesses.

7. I have been put in city and countrey to remove my habitation about twelve times, and my person twenty, in the midst of my pains, to my great cost and trouble.

8. How many thousand pounds my conscience hath cost me in the loss of a bishoprick (by the Lord Chancellor offered) since 1661. besides all other losses and charges, I leave you to compute, and ask you which of you hath lost more? tho I acknowledg with thankfulness to God that I never wanted food or raiment.

9. And while I am now writing for Parochial churches and communion, and know no Law of the land that I break, I am hated; and while I keep my bed in pain, or my couch, there are new assaults which I think not fit to publish.

10. And all this is but as a flea-biting in comparison of the suffering which I carry about me by continual pain or languor through age and many uncurable diseases: And under the expectations of death, how small a matter is it to me, whether I dye in a Gaol for my duty to God, or in my hired house, out of which I have very few times gone these two years, but it hath been a prison to me. What difference but conceit and consent? If our Rulers think it for the interest of any cause or party that I dye in prison, I shall acknowledg Gods will in the effect of theirs, and it shall not be in their power to make me suffer for any thing but my duty to God (besides faults long ago pardoned, and common humane infirmities). And it is not mens calling duty by the name of the most odious sins, that depriveth Martyrs of their reward with God. The false imputation of sin by men, was not the least part of the sufferings of Christ and his Apostles, and the Martyrs in all ages.

XVII. And because others as well as I, have need of such admonition, I will tell my Brethren, that our chief work is (the same with *Foes*) to frustrate the Tempter, and see that *in all this we sin not, nor charge God foolishly*: And he that only triumpheth in suffering in conscience of his innocency, and doth not know that suffering hath its proper temptations, and studyeth not wisely how to escape them, will suffer more by himself than by all his enemies.

I will therefore tell you what are the temptations here which I fear and watch against.

1. Lest the injuries of men should *destroy my due charity to them*: Tho its true that the setled Study and labour of some, for factious or carnal ends, be to destroy Christian Love, and serious Godliness, and the Souls, Bodies, and estates of the most innocent who they think stand in their way, (*and falsehood, hatred and destruction* are the Devils work and image) and no man must extenuate such crimes, John 8. 41, 42. Yet Diabolisme is not to be imputed *to all* that men *suffer by*; muchless to our *Governours, whom we must honour*: *Paul* himself persecuted in ignorance; and Christ said, *they know not what they do*? Much less must we blame others, if truly the cause be only in our selves.

2. Much more must we watch against desires of revenge, or call for fire from Heaven, or imitate any that injure us, by requiting evil with evil, but see that we forgive as we would be forgiven. If they be impenitent, and God forgive them not, their suffering will be heavy enough.

3. We must watch against blinding passions, that it carry us not into contrary extremes, that we may be far enough from sin; and so lest we fall into sin on the other side. Too few can keep to the line of truth; most reel like drunkards from side to side.

4. We are much in danger of *biassed study*; never studying *impartially what may be said against us*, and *for our opposers*, but only all that may be said *for us against them*.

5. Men that have a good cause are too apt to betray and spoil it by *an ill manner* of defending it, by *mixt errors*, *ill arguments* or *passions*, to the hardening of the adversaries and afflictors.

6. We must take heed that we fear not *suffering wrong*, more than *doing wrong*. He that *doth the wrong* is a far greater sufferer or loser, than he that *is wronged*. Our study must be, that we neither *think*, *wish*, *speak*, or *do* any wrong to our adversaries and afflictors.

7. We must watch lest the *great wickedness* of any adversaries should be so much in our eye, as to tempt us to make light of our

own

own sin, because it is not so great as theirs.

8. And we must watch lest the conscience of our *good cause* or *innocency to man*, should make us foget our *many sins against God*, for which he may permit men by injury to afflict us.

9. We must watch lest we judge of the *Cause* by the *Person*, and should take *truth* to be *falshood*, and *good* to be *evil*, because *bad men* or *adversaries* own it; or lest we take *falshood* to be *truth*, and *evil* to be *good*, because *good men* hold it; and lest in Love or Pity we *justifie the sin* of any sufferers.

10 But we must specially take heed lest fleshly interest and love of riches, liberty or life, should bias and blind our judgments, to take any thing to be Lawful which we think is necessary to our quietness and safety, and to use sinful means to avoid danger and sufferings.

These are my Studies, and I think them necessary to all.

And the rather when (it grieveth my heart to see, so) many carryed by suffering so far from unity, charity, and moderation, that they even joyn with those whom they sharpliest accuse, (tho by other reasons) to do their *very work*, and to destroy that which they think they are promoting. For instance,

1. They blame the Papists and such conformists for saying that the *Ministers* of the Reformed Churches are *no true Ministers*: And *they say the same*.

2. They blame them for saying *their Churches are no true Churches*. *And they say the same*.

3. They blame them for recusancy, and saying it is unlawful to communicate with them; and *they say the same*.

4. They blame them that *silence Ministers*, and forbid and hinder them from worshipping God. And they themselves dissuade all the *land from all publick Church-worship*, where none but with those that use the Liturgy can be had.

5. They justly blame *Love-killing reproachful Sermons*. And they write *Love-killing reproachful Books*.

6. They justly blame *false accusers of particular persons*, and they *falsely accuse almost all the Churches on Earth, as no true Churches*.

7. *They are justly for mutual forbearance*, and against *cruelty*; and they unjustly aggravate the faults of almost all Church-worshippers on earth, as so odious that it must be separated from; and in a sort excommunicate them

8. They fear Popery is ready to take possession of the Land and Church, and they exhort all Protestants to forsake all the publick Churches

churches, which are the Garison of the Protestant cause, that so the gates may be set open, and the Adversaries may find the houses ready swept and garnished, or the Garison emptied for their coming.

9. They are against the ejecting of the Ministers 1662. and yet crying down a *Comprehension*, they would not have them restored, unless it were on terms that will take in them also (and who knoweth whom?)

10. Yea, the very top of Popery is to *appropriate all power of church-government and worship to the Clergy*, and to make Magistrates therein but the Clergies Executioners, saying they are only for *civil government*, for the body, but the Pope and Clergy only for *Religious government* of the church, and for the souls. And some called by dividing names among us, say, That Christ only and his Ministers have power in such matters, and that Princes sin if they command but a *Translation*, a *reverent gesture*, a *church-ornament*, and such circumstances; and that it's a sin to obey them.

When I see that exasperation by afflicters hath cast some sufferers into such self-contradicting ways, I will set on my heart and judgment a double watch in sufferings and abuses.

And now Reader I again say, That tho I was dragg'd to this sort of work as against my will, I thank God (and my sober sort of Opponents) for calling me to it, that before I dye I might explain my Writings, and not by writing only against one extreme, leave them behind me as snares to tempt men to the other extreme.

And I here leave my testimony again against all malignity that would charge these errors on the innocent for a cloak of hatred, and cruelty, and oppression, that *I know not one meer Nonconformist that holdeth any of these errors*; and *I* verily believe that the *Independents* that *I* am acquainted with, are true servants of Christ; and many called *Anabaptists*, sober, godly Christians; and that some called *Separatists* retain Christian charity, and meerly for fear of sinning, flye too far from others.

And as for all the rest, it is not mens calling them all *Dissenters*, nor their suffering together, that can make the innocent responsible for the faulty, who perhaps do more against their mistakes, than ever such Accusers did (to cure them).

And I must tell the *Abaddons*, that the opposition that hath been raised against them among those that I was acquainted with before 1641, and 1642, was caused chiefly by the badness of those that made it their trade to preach against strict and serious obedience to God, as *Puritanism*, and Hypocrisie, and made it the Ladder of their aspiring Ambition

tion to make such odious, and to hunt with jealous severity [illegible] for mutual help in the ways of Salvation, to pray together ([illegible] they fasted) or consulted how to obey Gods Law: Justacting over [illegible] of the Eps that *Martin* separated from, described by *Sulpitius* [illegible] rendering all suspected of *Priscillianism* that were more than [illegible] in reading the Scripture, Fasting and Praying) and clapping on the back with encouragement the Drunkards and prophane ignorant rabble, who in every Town were the haters of the godly Conformists and Nonconformists; and making these the instruments of their malice, and praising them, and the multitude of ignorant, reading Priests, as more worthy Subjects, than men fearing God. *Ri. Hooker* in his Preface describeth these; and he that readeth his *Europæ Speculum*, may know that it was no better Conformists that his most beloved Pupil, Sir *Edwin Sandys* was against, while he was one of the zealous Parliamentarians.

It's true that many were very hot against Bishop *Laud* and the *Arminians*, and against Dr. *Heylin*, and Dr. *Pockington*, for proving *Sunday no Sabbath*, and calling the *Table an Altar*, and the *Ministers, Priests*, and the *Sacrament a Sacrifice*.

Blame not men that had read of their principles and practice, how *Rome* is a Leech that must live on blood, and cannot stand without it, if they were afraid of coming thither again, or drawing too near it. Upon my knowledg, the debauchery and malignity of many that hunted them, and would not let them stay at home in peace, and the terror of two hundred thousand murdered in *Ireland*, was it that drove most that ever I knew into the Parliaments Army: And fear doth often drive men to seek for self-defence to that which seemeth next at hand. Had those whom they feared been such as their functions obliged them to be, men of Holiness, Love and Peace, they would have been less prejudiced against the rest; they bore easily with Dr. *Chappel*, Mr. *Mayden*, and some other godly charitable men that were reputed *Arminians*.

I here adjoin it to my confessions. 1. That I thought worse of that called *Arminianism* than I should have done: (and have proved in my Catholick Theology, (not yet writ against by any that I know of) that the difference is not in any great and intolerable error on either side). 2. That the practice of them that prophaned the Lords day, and the malignity of their abettors, made me too much offended at the books that called the *Lords day no Sabbath*, and the *Ministers, Priests*, and the *Table, an Altar*, and the *Sacrament, a Sacrifice*. [illegible]

*

that these allegorical Names were usual with the best of Churches without contradiction: And that the *Lords Day* is never called *the Sabbath* in the New Testament; and that the *Sabbath* in the Bible signifieth *a day of ceremonial Rest*, which was a *Jewish Ceremony*; and that all such are by *Paul* said to be put down, and that the *Lords Day* is a day of *holy Assemblies* and rejoicing in spiritual, Evangelical Worship.

Ignorance and *prejudice* in these controversies prevailed, not from *argument*, but from the *experience* of the *quality of* too many that opposed them: They thought it a most improbable thing, that God should illuminate vicious, worldly haters of Godliness, and desert those that most desired to please him.

And of late times, what abundance have been driven from the publick Churches, by those that rail at them when they come there, and would get the Birds into their Net by throwing stones and bawling at them; and would get the fish to take the bait, by beating the Waters.

The Bishop of *Worcesters* silencing me, and preaching as he did, and the imprisonment of many of the people after, affected my old hearers with so much distast of that sort of men, that all the Writings and perswasions I could use, would not reconcile them, nor scarce keep them from falling out with me for my perswasions: And now they have a Worthy, Pious, preaching Bishop, a Man of Love and Peace, and a good Minister, they all crowd the Church, and are like to fall in love with such Bishops.

And I must testifie, that with the generality of the Nonconforming Laity, I never found, but it was *good preaching* and *good living* that won their Love: And they will honour and follow such men, whether Bishops, Conformists, or Nonconformists.

XV. Since the writing of this, I understand that some timerous persons have been afraid to communicate in publick, or joyn with the Liturgy, by hearing that some that have done it, have been so troubled in Conscience, that they have fallen into despair, and a doleful state of trouble.

To this I answer, 1. You shall never prove that I have perswaded any Minister, to give Christs body and blood as a Drench to the unwilling, or to make the Sacrament of Love, the Instrument of Malice or Cruelty, or a snare to strangle Souls. It must be that Offences must come, but wo to them by whom it cometh. The old Church made men

beg for Church-Communion; if any withdraw from it, and excommunicate themselves, they did not send them to Goal for their Communion to force them to say, that they repent, and to force them to Communion.

2. But I must say, that these Ministers or people that have so ill taught these troubled Souls (by Doctrine or Example) as to tempt them to take their Duty (or a lawful thing) for so deadly a sin, are far from being guiltless of their Trouble, Distraction or Destruction. If any should make them believe that it were such a dangerous thing to pray by a Book, to sing *Davids* Psalms, to Communicate with Presbyterians, not to be rebaptized, not to keep the *Saturday* Sabbath, *&c.* And then, when he hath affrighted one to make away himself in melancholy despair, should use this instance as an argument to affright away others also from their duty; I should think that he were too blame: This were not by *good words and fair speeches*, but by *bad words and deeds*, to deceive the hearts of the simple, in causing divisions and offences.

3. I believe I have had with me in my time many scores that have had such melancholly terrors, without any such cause; and must the matter of their trouble therefore be proved faulty? I have known those that for many years could have no peace of mind, while they continued Orthodox and Religious; and at last hearing Irreligious Sadducees, turned filthy, and ranters, and were never under trouble more (that could be perceived) but boasted of their peace. Who knoweth not that Melancholly maketh many of the most sound and blameless persons, like *Spira*, a weary of their lives, thorough desparation.

4. I can tell these Objectors of eminent ancient godly men, that long forbore publick Communion, and at last used it, and have had more comfort and edification, than ever they had before; and the more for breaking through all the sharp Censures of their former company, in obedience to their Consciences herein: And when they have seen a scandalous person with them at the Sacrament, have gone with Humility, Love, and Tears, and told him of his sin and danger, and had such success as hath comforted them more than avoiding that Communion ever did: yea, I know those that being threatned by violent Pastors, that use Dissenters with rigor, have humbly and submissively so pleaded with them from Scripture and experience, against that Spirit and Way, as hath overcome them, and melted them into a more tender and peaceable mind and course.

A Poſtſcript on a Book of Mr. J. Fs.

SINCE the Writing of all foregoing, I have received another Book ſent me by J. F. Whether he will be angry if I expound this J. Faldo, I cannot tell; I read it over to ſee if there were any thing in it that ſhould change my Judgment: But I will not promiſe to do ſo by any more ſuch. Nor will I ſo much as tell the Reader what my Judgment ſaid of it in the reading; much leſs write down the Anſwers which readily offered themſelves to my underſtanding as I went on; for it would but more provoke him, I ſee, and do the Reader little good, unleſs by helping him to lament the churches caſe through the infirmities of ſuch as I and he are; And the more patiently to bear all our preſent ſufferings, by conſidering how unable we are to agree what to chuſe for our ſelves, if we had our wills, and how far we ſhould be from deſired concord.

I will not write a Book to contend on the queſtion, Whether Mr. Faldo or I be the wiſer or better man: I am conſcious of ſo much ignorance and badneſs, that if it may edifie the Reader, let him think of me as ill, as Mr. Faldo and all ſuch men would have him: If he have a good cauſe, I wiſh the Reader may be of his mind: If not, I find not my ſelf obliged to talk on againſt ſuch Writers any further, for his reſcue; nor do I think I can ſay any thing herein, which at his rate Mr. Faldo cannot anſwer.

I only ſay, that he and ſuch other have ſatisfied me, That the Liturgy-Worſhip in the common Lords Day office is comparatively purer than the Worſhip of many is like to be, who oppoſe it. His Counſel is good, to know what the Worſhip is before I conſent to it: I have tried what is in the Liturgy; I concurred with many better men, 1661 in telling the World, how far we could approve or uſe it. I find in it much good, and in the ordinary Lords Day common ſervice, no fault that ſhould alienate me from communion with the Church therein.

To talk of faults in Baptizing, Burial, Marrying, &c. is to ſay nothing to this point; I never ſaw any of theſe uſed ſince I joined with the Church in the Lords-Day Worſhip: But how to try Mr. F. his Worſhip before-hand, I know not He ſaith, that if we will be at the coſt of it, we may have better worſhip. And tho he ſeem diſpleaſed for being called a conſenter to my catholick communion, either he conſented that the Pariſh-Church-Worſhip ſhould rather be uſed than none, or elſe (which I ſuſpect) when I have read his Book, I cannot underſtand ſo much as what he is for or againſt; what he meaneth by a Meeting of four, whether he take it for a Church, I know not: I take it not for a Church, that hath no Miniſter or Sacrament: And if he know of ſo many ſure, or hundred thouſand Nonconformable Miniſters as may guide all the people

[illegible] as such Churches of four, I do not [illegible] simply unlawful, it is so to all [illegible] in the Kings Dominions, that can have no [illegible] with the Liturgy, at what rate soever they would [illegible] his conceits of my self contradictions were as true [illegible] tell him other reasons of what he counteth unaccountable [illegible] wrote one Book in 1659, and another in 1684. I am now [illegible] than I was then; and its a shame to learn nothing in so many [illegible] more above all worldly hopes than he is: I am past all [illegible] have less cause of fear than he: They will hardly confine [illegible] narrower than my Bed and Couch. My glass is almost [illegible] more apprehensive of my speedy account, and it awe me [illegible] but the truth, without dawbing with one extream or [illegible] blame. And I have seen some more of the experience of [illegible] (Alas I saw too much before).

And after all, comparing all together, I leave [illegible]

1. That I had rather the Church had a Liturgy ([illegible] what Worship they meet for) with free prayer also in its place [illegible] either alone.

2. If they must be separated when the Minister is of tryed [illegible] ability; I had rather have his free prayer alone. But for [illegible] had rather have the Liturgy alone.

And for instance, Mr. Faldo hath oft told me, that his [illegible] net (as I twice said before) not only omitted, but renounced [illegible] singing of Psalms for many years; that many of them were [illegible] nions, that he was put to much work to save them from being [illegible] at what cost they can now have Church-Meetings when he [illegible] know not).

For Mr. Faldo to hold up such a Church even to suffering [illegible] against Communion with the Liturgy, where there are able [illegible] either erroneous partiality in him, or I am blind in my [illegible]

To which I further add again, that I cannot expect that [illegible] Doctrine than they studiously Write; nor that they pray [illegible] they preach; and if Mr. Faldo, and all such Writers, so [illegible] and so live, (much more if also their Churches have such [illegible] aforesaid, and some of them unordained Ministers, [illegible] of many contrary doctrines) I take the Common [illegible] and Communion, to be much purer than theirs. The Lord [illegible] sets wiser, better, and more peaceable than we are.

FINIS

POSTSCRIPT

Aug. 25. 1684.

HE that gave me notice of this Book which I answer, did withall send me a Manuscript to be privately answered, containing the very same things, but somewhat enlarged: His displeasure against my former mention of his private Writings to me, and the Contents, made me confident that he would not have any thing Published which I should answer to his last: By which I found my self in a notable strait: For if he at once privately sent me his reasons, and also in another Book Printed them, if I should answer his private papers (which reason forbad me doing in my condition, for his use alone) I should judg my self forestalled from answering the Printed Book, because the matter being the very same (and 'tis likely by the same man) I should be supposed to have broken the Laws of Civility, to have answered his private papers. But (having no Amanuensis, or Scribe to take any Copy of his papers, or my own) I thought it the best way to return his unanswered (they being Written for my use, which Reading will as fully serve as answering them) but supposing the Printed papers must be answered, I inserted also an answer to the strength of all his additionals in the Manuscript.

And at last he giveth me some notice of his thoughts of publishing the Manuscript, or a vindication of it. Which falls well for the Readers use, that I have answered that Manuscript before it is Published, without taking notice of it, and of avoiding wordy altercations.

The Author professeth himself my great acquaintance. Who he is, I know not; but he seemeth to be a very rational sober man. God forbid that I should ever contribute (unless duty do it accidentally) to the grievance of such men. I doubt not but he speaketh as he thinketh. And I doubt I have given him occasions by some uncautelous words in my writings. I truly thank God and him, that I am called to review them, and to clear my sence before I die. And I adjure the tearing persecuting sect, to think no more strangely and odiously of our differences in this case, than of the sharp contention of Paul and Barnabas; or that men should scramble if Gold and Pearls were scattered in the streets, where dogs and swine would never strive about them. Gods servants would please him: we are all of weak understandings: The Wisest best know their weakness: The rest are neareſt the state of the Fool, who rageth and is confident. It is impossible but offence must come, Luke 17. 1. But wo, wo, wo, to any who will make canons so extreme hard for men to agree in as terms of their Union and Communion, and excommunicate all that say a word against any word, ceremony, circumstances or office of their train; and when they have done, cry out against men for not agreeing to every syllable, which a thousand to one are uncapable of understanding, and the better men understand them, the more they dislike them.

A Short Answer to the Chief Objections in a Book ENTITULED: *A Theological Dialogue*, &c.

§ 1. THE chief matter of this Book is already answered by the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. 1. 10. 1 Cor. 3. Rom. 16. 16, 17. Eph. 4. 4. to the 17. Phil. 2. 1, 2, 3. 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. John 17. 22, 23, 24. And 1 Cor. 12. And Acts 20. 30.

The Spirit and Stile of it is answered in the third Chapter of *James* throughout.

I have nothing then to do but to answer the pretended argumentation of it: For the Author shall not draw me from my Defensive part, to play the part of a plaintif against others, or to wast my time in altercations, and spend many sheets to tell the world that another man hath not skill to speak sence, and that he seduceth others by ambiguous words, and by confusions.

Obj. 1. To prove us sinful for being members of the Church of *England*, he saith Pag. 15. [*Is he not* by Communion in the Sacarment of Baptisme made a member? Page 13. *Is not Baptisme* (*according to the Liturgy*) *a symbol of incorporation into the Church of England? Confirmation another? receiving the Lords Supper another symbol?* &c.

Ans. 1. Baptism as such incorporateth no man into any particular Church, but only into the universal, as it did the Eunuch, Acts 8.

2. The ceremonies or circumstantials of Baptism, only shew what men submit to, rather than to be unbaptized, and not what particular Church they are of.

3. This objection would insinuate that all that are Baptized in the publick manner in *England*, were thereby incorporated into an unlawful Church, which they must by being rebaptized, or by open renunciation disclaim, And so that it is not Lawful to Communicate with any that were Baptized in the Parish Church, till they have repented it, or are

Rebaptized, or Penitent openly. And if you muſt have all in *England* renounce their Baptiſm before you will take their Communion for lawful, the ſame reaſon will hold againſt your Communion with all the reſt of the Churches on Earth. And when you cut off your ſelf from all, ſaving a ſhred, are you a Member of the undivided Body of Chriſt?

4. If our Baptiſm in *England* doth incorporate into their Church (which you ſuppoſe is no *Church*, being a falſe Church), doth not Baptiſm into your Church incorporate Perſons into yours? And what then, if your Schiſm prove a Sin? What if Rebaptizing prove a Sin? What if the Covenant deſcribed by your Client, (to obey none but Chriſt, in matters belonging to Worſhip) prove a Sin? are they all guilty of all theſe, and ſuch others?

Obj. II. *All that are liable to a Church Excommunication when they have offended, are declared Members of the Church. But all Communicants and Native Inhabitants are ſo. Therefore the Law hath excepted none. — How comes it to paſs, that the Church hath power of excommunicating any Perſon, but by vertue of Incorporation, which ſhe hath by the ſame Law? He that is not in the Church, how comes he to be caſt out? — Is he not by Communion in the Sacrament of baptiſm made a Member?*

Anſ. 1. Doth their eſteeming you a Member, prove that you are ſo?

2. You know that they excommunicate Papiſts, and Atheiſts, who deride them for it, and ſay, It's a ſtrange Church that will caſt us out, becauſe they cannot compel us to come in.

3. If this be a good argument, that all are of their Church that are excommunicate, then you are either ſafe from Excommunication; or of their Church, whether you will or not: If to make good your argument, you will aver that no Separatiſt, Independent, Presbyterian, Anabaptiſt, or Quaker, was ever excommunicate, or impriſoned as ſuch, you will change the Current of Intelligence, and comfort many that can believe you, and teach them how to eſcape a Priſon for the time to come. But if not, you make your ſelf and all theſe parties incorporate Members of the Church of *England*, as well as me.

4. Do you think a Lay Civilian by Excommunicating, can prove or make a man a member of any Church againſt his will? Then mens Argument againſt Pariſh Churches, for want of conſent, is void. They may be made ſuch againſt their wills.

5. But tho few men diſlike the Lay-Excommunicators and Abſolvers more than I do (nor grudge more at the Biſhops and Deans who uſe them, and let them put their names to the Excommunications; eſpecially of the poor Church-Wardens for not ſwearing, *&c.*) yet let us not render them cauſeleſly ridiculous. I imagine that they excommunicate not known Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, and ſuch like, out of their Church (who they know were

were never in it) but out of the Universal Church: If this be not their sense, let them give it you themselves, for I am not bound to be their Interpreter.

And yet to moderate our Censures of them, I'le tell you a wonder: Within this hour I received a Letter of credible Intelligence, of a Chancellor who hearing of a Conventicle not presented by the Church-Wardens, and being told that they met to repeat the publick Sermon, said, God forbid that they should be hindered.

Obj. III. Page 8. *A Church in a sense is a Christian Kingdom, that is, a Royal Nation under Christ their King. But there is no such Gospel-Church in your sense; for there was neither Christian Kingdom nor King in the Apostles days.*

Ans. The Institution may be in the Gospel before the existence: Christian Kings and Kingdoms are neither unlawful, nor needless, because there were none then. The Prophets not only foretel that Nations shall come in to Christ and serve him, but that all Nations that do it not, shall perish. And Christs Commission to his Apostles was, *To go and Disciple all Nations* (as much as in them lay) *baptizing them.* Nations as such, were, first to be *discipled*, and *then baptized*, (Infants are part of Nations). And *Matth.* 23. Christ would have gathered *Jerusalems* Children (all the *Jewish* Nation) into his Church, as a Hen gathereth her Chickens under her Wings. And *Rom.* 11. Only their own unbelief broke them off from being a National Church, (including Infants). And it is part of the Saints triumph, that *the Kingdoms of the World are become the Kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ.* If you will read Mr. *Beverlys* Book, called *The whole duty of Nations*, it will give you full proof of this.

Where hath the Gospel *extensively* much prospered where Princes and Rulers were not Christians? The *Turks* give liberty of Religion. And yet the sometime famous *Greek* Churches, (*Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Colos*, *Ephesus*, *Laodicea*, *Philadelphia*, and more than all the *West*, are Apostatized, or withered to a few ignorant vicious scandalous Christians.

Obj. IV. 8. *If such a confederation in lawful Circumstantials, as well as Integrals, will make a Church, I know not why we may not have a Catholick Visible Church organized, if this be a due acception of a Church.*

Ans. This is as much as to say, *If the name Church may be used equivocally* (as all words must) *of several sorts, then all those sorts may be the same.* I deny it. If you dislike the use of the name, you have your liberty as a *Grammarian* to forbear it. But sure the *Name* and the *Thing* are not all one, nor the Controversies about them. 2. But we have a Catholick Visible Church Organized, as I have oft proved against the Papists, *viz.* under one, Christ the Head, and his Ministers as his subordinate Officers.

Obj.

Obj. V. Page 3. *If you touch a mans finger, you touch the man: we have communion with an* integrum perpartes; *and with a Genus by the Species; and with both by individuals: Nay as every part of the Scripture, one verſe or ſentence of it makes up ſence; ſo every part of the Liturgy as in form and manner therein contrived, is Liturgy; and worſhip thereafter is according to the Liturgy, tho it be but part of the worſhip.*

Page 20. *As for the falſeneſs in Integrals, it gives the denomination to the whole; for an Integral part is an eſſential part of the whole.* Much more there is to the ſame purpoſe, making him guilty of all that uſeth a part.

Anſ. 1. You have the freedom of uſing words at your pleaſure, but not impoſing them on mankind; when neceſſity hath taught the World to diſtinguiſh eſſential and integral parts, you have no authority to confound their Language, by the quibble of calling *Integrals eſſential cauſes of the whole*: *A totum per aggregationem*; as a heap of Sand, or a field of Graſs, is not conſtituted of a proper eſſentiating form, and ſo homogeneous matter aggregate is all the being it hath. And if you make contiguity an eſſential cauſe, or how elſe you will, you have liberty of ſpeech: But we will not be cheated by it to believe that it cauſeth any more than *Totality* or *Integrality*, and the abſence of it is a privation of no more. And all mens Graces, Obedience, and Worſhip, are defective in point of Integrality and degree, and I hope you will not ſay that they need no favour, or pardon, or amendment.

2. All human actions have their faults: muſt we therefore do nothing, or converſe with no men? *England* is one Kingdom; If there be one or many faults in its Laws or officers, may we therefore obey none that are faultleſs? The Laws are the Rule of National Juſtice; may a Judg, Juſtice, Officer or ſubject uſe none of them, becauſe ſome are faulty? Doth that make him guilty of all? *Bonum eſt ex cauſis integris:* The fault of a part may indeed denominate the whole faulty ſo far. But the whole Law or Liturgy may be called faulty for a part, and yet he that uſeth either, not be guilty of any of the bad part, for uſing the good. The Law and Liturgy are one thing, and the uſe is another: Its faults are no further his, than he owneth them; your Bread or Meat may be called bad, if part only be bad, and yet if you eat none but the good part, it will not hurt you.

2. But if it muſt be otherwiſe, no man may hear you, or joyn with your Churches: And do you think (as aforeſaid) that Mr. *Faldo*, and all his Church at *Barnet*, lived not in a ſinful communion very many years, that omitted at leaſt an integral part of publick worſhip, the ſinging of Gods praiſe? Chriſt with his Diſciples ſung a Hymn after the Sacrament. The *Jews* Church made it the chief part of their Worſhip. *James* preſcribeth it us in all our Holy Mirth, ſuch as the Lords Day is appointed for, 1 Cor. 14. 26. *Every one had a Pſalm*, and with them *no one had a Pſalm*, tho

tho his Judgment was for it; the queſtion was, Whether he ſhould forſake them for refuſing it: I thought not, becauſe it was better that they had ſomething that was good, than nothing. But your argument would not only unchurch them, but make all ſinners that communicated with them: for omiſſions of great duties are faults, and greater faults than tolerable failings in performance: He that prayeth not at all, doth worſe than he that prayeth by a Book; and he that preacheth or teacheth not at all, doth worſe than he that readeth a Sermon; ſo that their total ſtated omiſſion and oppoſition to ſinging, by your falſe rule, denominated them *no worſhippers of God*, if the whole muſt be denominated from a part.

How many private Meetings in *London*, never ſing a Pſalm for fear of being diſcovered? Yea, how many ſeldom read a Chapter, but only preach and pray, and ſometime adminiſter the Sacrament? Muſt we needs ſay therefore that they omit all Worſhip?

VI. On ſuch occaſions I argued, That if we muſt not communicate with any Pariſh Church becauſe of the faults of the Liturgy, it will follow, that we muſt not communicate with any Church on Earth that hath as great faults; and that by this we muſt renounce Communion with all Chriſts Body on Earth: All the *Armenians*, *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, *Copties*, *Abaſſines*, *Georgians*, *Greeks*, *Ruſſians*, *Papiſts*, yea *Lutherans*, have a more faulty Liturgie, or manner of worſhip, than the *Engliſh*. Yea the Churches called Calviniſts have their Liturgies and faults: And I inſtanced in *Switzerland*, becauſe as God hath of late moſt preſerved their peace, ſo they are taken to be the honeſteſt ſort of Proteſtants, that in poverty ſerve God with ſoundeſt doctrine, and leaſt ſcandal of Life, but yet have no proper diſcipline but the Magiſtrates? Is it a ſin to have confederacy or Communion with their Churches?

To this he plainly ſaith Page 11. It is: *That is, all that confederate with them, as Churches, are guilty of their error, called Eraſtian: For ſubjection to ſuch diſcipline is the condition of their Communion.*

Anſ. Subjection is an equivocal word: If it were by profeſſion or ſubſcription of conſent, it were indeed to be guilty of that error (tho not by a fault of the Part denominating the whole, to make their worſhip unlawful, or their Churches none) but if by ſubjection you mean but joyning in their Churches as Chriſtian and Proteſtant for doctrine and worſhip, notwithſtanding the defect which they cannot help, yea which they diſclaim, bare accuſation will not prove this a ſin; but by this we ſee how much of Chriſts Church you are for ſeparating from.

2. For my part I have oft publiſhed, That it is not the leaſt part of my charge againſt Popery, that they unchurch almoſt all the Chriſtian World ſave themſelves: But yet they are about a 4th or 3d part of profeſſed Chriſtians themſelves; and divers of them do not unchurch the *Greeks*;

But to unchurch or forbid Communion with all that are as faulty, as the *Helvetians* and all other Proteſtant Churches that have Liturgies or partial faults, is that which I dare not be guilty of: I think that to ſay, That a thouſand parts to one of Chriſts Church, are none of his Churches, is next to depoſing him from his Kingdom: Much like as it would be to ſay, no part of *London* is the Kings but *Amen Corner*, nor any part of *England* but *Barnet* or *Brentford*.

3. And is it not one of our juſt accuſations of the Papiſts, That they ſay all the Proteſtant Churches are no true Churches, and the Miniſters no true Paſtors; and that Communion with them is unlawful? and ſhall we now juſtifie them, and ſay as they (tho not on the ſame Reaſon, but for a far ſmaller difference)? Is this our running from Popery?

4. Yea, is it not the great thing that we accuſe the ſuperconformiſts for? That they make us to be no true Miniſters or Churches? and are we indeed of the ſame mind? One ſide ſaith, We are no true Miniſters for want of Bps. Ordination, &c. Another ſide ſaith, You are no true Miniſters for having Communion with the Biſhops and Churches, *&c.*

VII. I mentioned the Judgment and Practiſe of the old Nonconformiſts and Presbyterians, not as a rule, but as a comparative example. To this he ſaith, p. 11. *You and they might as well own the Church of* England *in the form and conſtitution as it is eſtabliſhed as the Pariſh churches to be particular Goſpel churches*, &c. —— P. 12. *To ſay you join with a quatenus, and own not the very conſtitution and ſtanding of the church, with which you join in the ſenſe the church aſſerts it, is the greateſt equivocation in practice that is: The old Nonconformiſts nor you are to be no preſidents to us in this caſe —— So far as the old Nonconformiſts, and the old reforming conformiſts went forward with Reformation to bring the church out of the wilderneſs, we honour them; but when they turn back again, and entice the people ſo to do, we are afraid to tempt God in that manner* ——— P. 14. *Thoſe old Nonconformiſts that did ſo, are no preſidents to us; If they halted and were lame, muſt we be ſo? ſuch communicants are not acceptable to any Church, and I know what Church would never admit them, were it not to puniſh and expoſe them and their profeſſion, as ridiculous and inconſiſtent with its ſelf: And as for* FRENCH and DUTCH, *what are they to us*, &c. —— P. 16. He calls Mr. *Fenns* joining in the Liturgy with exception of ſome part [*The ſullen practice of a half-paced doting Nonconformiſt.*

Anſ. Firſt to the Cauſe, and ſecondly to the Perſons.

1. To call any practice, *Equivocation*, or by any ill name, is no proof that it is ſo; nor is here a word of true proof given us: I ask the Conſiderate; Is it in the power of a Law-maker, to make all Worſhip and Duty to God unlawful by commanding to do it for an unlawful end, or upon falſe principles? What if a Law ſaid, All people ſhall worſhip God, not

becauſe

becauſe the Scripture commandeth it, but becauſe the State commands it? Would this make it unlawful to worſhip God? I would diſown the Principle, and go on.

What if the Law ſhould ſay, The Paſtoral Office is not of Divine Right, but humane, muſt the office therefore be renounced? And why can ſuch a Law any more bind me to judg of Church-conſtitutions by the Lawmakers words, rather than by Gods Word?

Suppoſe that the *Anabaptiſts* ſay, That rebaptizing is the true way of Church-gathering: Is it a ſin to communicate with them, if they will receive me when I profeſs the contrary.

I am againſt the Covenant which you defend, as making an *Independent* Church: Is it therefore a ſin to communicate with them, becauſe it is not as conſtituted by that Covenant?

What do Parties more differ in of late, than Forms, Orders, Modes and Circumſtances of Church Government; and if they be of many contrary minds, were it twenty, there can be but one of them in the right: And is it unlawful to join with all the reſt? Muſt we needs be ſure which of theſe is in the right?

Almoſt all the Churches that I hear of in the world, have their agreed profeſſions publiſhed; the Proteſtants are gathered in the *Corpus confeſſionum*; the Engliſh Church Principles and Orders are expreſſed in the Book of Canons, the Liturgy, Ordination, the 39 Articles, the Homilies, the Apology, *&c.* Muſt every one ſtay from their Churches, till he hath read and underſtood all theſe Books, and be ſure that there is no fault or error in them? What if it be poor men or women that cannot buy all theſe books? and what if they cannot read? whom ſhall they get to read them all? and how ſhall they have time to ſtudy them, or capacity to underſtand them, when we can hardly get them to learn a Catechiſm and anderſtand it?

You will ſay, That is their crime that make all theſe Confeſſions and Books: They will anſwer, but that's none of our fault: We made them not, and yet muſt we not communicate with any Church that maketh ſuch? The old Separatiſts, called *Browniſts*, publiſhed their confeſſion, and therein owned many Pariſh Churches in *England*, and Communion with them: I recited their words in my Reaſons, *&c.* But you are gone beyond them: The *New-England* churches printed their confeſſion, and all there agreed not to it: The Engliſh *Independents* publiſhed their Principles and Confeſſions: And the *Presbyterians* and they agreed in the *Weſtminſter* Synods confeſſion, catechiſm and Directory: Is every poor Man and Woman bound to ſtay from all their

churches, (when for 14 years they had no other) till they understand all these, and know that they are faultless? Or if there be any fault in any one of all these books, is every one guilty of them that cometh to the churches?

The *Anabaptists* published their confession: The *Dutch* have theirs: Many churches agreed with them in the Synod of *Dort*. The *French* have theirs; the *Saxons*, the *Helvetians*, *Geneva*, the *Bohemians*, the *Protestants* in general had the *Augustane*, and many more have theirs. Reader, See with whom these Writers will hold communion, who make it unlawful to join with any church that have any fault in their constitutions, or agreed Doctrines or Orders.

Let us rise upward, till we come to the Apostles days: None of all these churches named, dare profess all their agreements and confession to be without fault, that ever I heard of, except the *English*, who bind Ministers to assent and consent to all things commanded and prescribed in three Books, and excommunicate those that say their Books or Ceremonies and Government hath any thing contrary to the Word of God; but no Lay-man is bound to believe them; *Wickliffe*, and *John Hus*, the *Waldenses*, and the *Bohemians* Confessions, are not faultless: Of the *Papist*, and the *Sccinians*, we will make no question; the forenamed churches of *Greeks*, *Russians*, *Armenians*, *Abassines*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, &c. are, alas, past question faulty: the general councils upward from that of *Trent*, *Basil*, *Constance*, &c. to the six first, yea, the four first, which some equal to the four Gospels, are far from being faultless in the Judgment of these Objectors, and of my self: the *Arrian* and other heretical councils are past question; even that of *Nice*, the first and best, I suppose he and I think did not well in setling church-power as they did, and forbidding all kneeling on the Lords days, in Adoration, and other the like: The *Donatists* and the *Novatians*, called the *Puritans* of those times, had faulty agreements; were it but for Bps. and Arch-Bps. he will think them so: this Writer can name no one church on the face of the Earth Orthodox or heretical (tho *Aerius* called *Presbyters* equal with Bps.) that was not for Bishops over *Presbyters* from the year 100 after Christ, till the Reformation, that ever I could read of: Yea, consider whether they were not in the Apostles days, when *Jerome*, who most depresseth this degree, saith, That there were such at *Alexandria* chosen by the Presbyters from the days of *Mark*: and *Mark* died long before *John* the Apostle: But Episcopacy is not all: Not only *Epiphanius* but all Church History that speaketh of such matters, agreeth, that (besides the croud of latter Ceremonies)

monies) there were certain ceremonies called the *customes of the Universal Church*, which all the known Churches agreed in, (even those that differ'd about *Easter-day*, and other such) that is, 1. Cloathing the Baptized in white Garments. 2. Giving them milk and hony to taſt. 3. Anointing them with Oyl. 4. Not kneeling in adoration on any Lords day, or any other day between *Easter* and *Whitſunday*. There is no notice when theſe began, ſo ancient were they, nor of any one Church or Chriſtian that refuſed them; but they were commonly called the Traditions Apoſtolical, or cuſtomes of the Univerſal Church.

Now I agree with this Author, that theſe things were indeed a deviation from the Apoſtles practice, and ought not to have been thus uſed: But the queſtion is, whether every Chriſtian was guilty of the fault that had communion with any of theſe churches? and whether had he then lived, he ſhould have ſeparated from all the Churches on earth?

By this you ſee, that this opinion muſt needs make men ſeekers, who ſay, that the church was in the wilderneſs, and loſt all true Miniſtry, (and, ſay they, particular churches, and Scripture) after the firſt (or at moſt the ſecond) century: and ſo that for fourteen hundred years Chriſt had no viſible Kingdom on earth: And conſequently, that we have no wiſer anſwer to the Papiſt [*where was your church before Luther*] than to ſay that it was *Inviſible*; that is, that we cannot prove that there was any ſuch thing on Earth; and conſequently, that we cannot prove that Chriſt had any Kingdom on earth, and was its King; that is, whether there was any Chriſt in actual church-adminiſtration? And doth ſeparating from the whole viſible church-communion agree with the prophecies and precepts of union? Was this church like a grain of Muſtard ſeed in its growth? Was all the wonderful works of redemption wrought for no viſible ſociety after one or two hundred years, in which a few perſecuted ones were viſible? Is not this the next ſtep (and a temptation) to utter infidelity? If Chriſt have now no viſible church on earth, but the people called *Browniſts* or *Separatiſts*, doth it anſwer the Scripture deſcription of him and his church? And is it not expoſing chriſtianity to the ſcorn of infidels, ſo to ſay? Would not almoſt all rather turn Papiſts, than believe this? And be rather of their church, than of none.

2. But let us next ſpeak of the perſons. I may ſpeak my thoughts without impoſing on you. I think that the Major vote is no rule to the Minor, nor always is in the right. If a hundred men that underſtand

ſtand not *Greek* or *Hebrew*, Tranſlate a Text one way, and a good Linguiſt another way, I will more ſuſpect their judgment than his. And ſo in the like caſe. But if I hear a few old perſons condemn the judgment of the generality that are far better acquainted with matters of the ſame nature, [as if School-boys that are but in their *Accidence*, ſhould oppoſe all the upper Forms in expounding *Horace*, or *Heſiod*, or *Homer*], which, think you, ſhould I moſt ſuſpect?— I ſay again to you, compare the writings of *Bucer*, *Peter Martyr*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Melanchon*, *Chamier*, *Blondel*, *Dailee*, and abundance ſuch; and alſo *Greenhams*, *Perkins*, Dr. *John Reignolds*, *Cartwrights*. *Dods*, *Hilderſhams*, *Hieroms Ameſius's*, *Baynes*, *Rollocks*, and many ſuch, yea with ſuch conformiſts as *Jewels*, Bp. *Downames*, *John Downames*, *Davenants*, *Bp. Halls*, *Arch-Bp. Uſhers*, *Bp. Rob. Abbots*, *Dr. Fields*, *Dr. Challoners*, *Dr. Airys*, &c. I ſay, compare theſe with the Theological writings of *Mr. Penry*, *Mr. Can*, and all other called ſeparatiſts or *Browniſts* in their times, and tell me whether theſe later did manifeſt more Holy Wiſdom in Heavenly things, more skill in all other points of Divinity, than the former: If their writings (giving Mr. *Ainſworth* his due honour in *Hebrew* and Piety) were as far below the other, as the lower forms of School-boys are beneath the higheſt, which ſhould we moſt ſuſpect to have had the greater or the leſſer light, ſpecially when the lower condemn and cut off themſelves from communion with all Chriſts known Churches on earth for thirteen hundread years. When Mr. *Smith* (and lately a very good man here) thought none fit to Baptize him again, but Baptized himſelf; was not that ſingularity a juſt cauſe of ſuſpicion? Yet I make not the old Nonconformiſts your rule.

VIII. I argued alſo, from the common frailties of us all, that it will be unlawful to communicate with any Church on earth, even with thoſe of the objectors mind, if we are guilty of the ſins in Doctrine, worſhip and diſcipline, of all Churches that we communicate with. I will aggravate none, nor render that odious which God accepteth: My work is to confute thoſe that do ſo. But I ſay, that 1. we have all many errors; And men uſe to put their errors into their prayers and preaching 2. Do not men uſe to deliberate more, and ſtudy what to write, than what to preach? And have men reaſon to be confident that our preaching will be more ſounder than our writing? This Author exclaims againſt me, as Popiſh, Arminian, for Juſtification by works, for merit, &c. May it not be expected that I preach as bad as I write? And is it not then a ſin to be my hearer? Can I think that

that he will not preach as ill as he writeth in this book? And are all ſinners therefore for hearing him? I promiſe him that if I know of any Pariſh Miniſter that will uſually preach with as much error, reflexion and gall as he here writeth, I will be none of that mans hearers, or uſual Communicants.

But to this he ſaith, P. 19. *We diſtinguiſh between the rule of worſhip, and the adminiſtration and performance:* ——— 1. *It is not ſins of ordinary infirmity.* 2. *Nor ſins not foreknown, ſo as to prevent joining with them, but them that worſhip God by a falſe rule,* &c.

Anſ. 1. This is the great ſtrength of all his Book, That we ſin by a falſe rule, but they ſin only againſt a true rule; but I think nothing is ſin indeed, but that which is againſt a true rule, even Gods word; making and uſing a falſe rule, is therefore ſin, becauſe it is againſt the true rule. Moſt hypocrites are ſuppoſed to own a true rule while they are falſe to it, and ſin againſt it. To ſin againſt knowledge, and an acknowledged rule, is an aggravation of the ſin, and ſuch ſhall be beaten with many ſtripes: *Paul* opens it to the *Jews*, Rom. 2. at large, therefore this will not excuſe our communion with ſuch.

2. This Reaſon croſſeth the buſineſs of the opponent; for whereas the greateſt reaſon againſt Communion with Pariſh Churches is the badneſs of the Communicants, and Miniſters lives; theſe are not the obeying of the Law or Canons, but diſobeying them: The Law, called the Rule, bids no man ſwear raſhly, lye, be drunk, unclean, ſlander, rail, *&c.* Nay it commandeth the Miniſter to deny the Sacrament to ſuch: Ignorance, unbelief, hypocriſie, are not commanded, but forbidden by that Rule: Miniſters break the rule, if they preach error, or hereſie, or againſt Love and Peace, and promote not Godlineſs, and mens ſalvation, with all holy diligence, by Doctrine and Life; ſo that no ſins againſt this is cauſe of ſeparation, if it be only uſing a falſe rule that is, juſt cauſe.

3. But what is the falſe Rule? The word *Rule* maketh all this excuſe and accuſation of his a meer equivocation: In general, a *rule* is any thing to which we purpoſely conform our actions, that they may be right: Of this there are divers ſorts.

1. The Primary Rule is the abſolute Law of God, to which all mens actions ſhould be conformed.

2. Subordinate humane Rules: Theſe are of divers ſorts. 1. The obliging commands of Authority. 1. Of Magiſtrates. 2. Paſtors. 3. Parents and Maſters of Families. 4. School-Maſters and Tutors of

of Youth, &c. 2. Contracts or Agreements of men for concord.

1. Gods Law is never a falſe rule, but an erring Expoſitor may make the words the matter of a falſe rule by putting on them a falſe ſenſe.

2. Juſt ſubordinate rules are not falſe, juſtly uſed. 1. Magiſtrates rule either by *common Laws*, or temporary and particular Mandates, both being obligatory to duty, and indeed but ſeveral ſorts of Laws, while they uſe but that authority which God gave them. Laws or Mandates are juſt rules.

2. Paſtors can make duty by ruling authority for none but the Flocks committed to them: They may command what God authorizeth them to command; whether it be by word or writing, is all one: And whether you will call it a Law or not, the name altereth not the caſe: Tho indeed in the general notion, all is true law, which authoritatively by command maketh a ſubjects duty. Its a true rule when the Ruler goeth not beyond his authority. *Heb.* 13. 7, 17, 24. 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12, 17, &c.

3. The ſame muſt be ſaid of Parents, Maſters, Tutors, &c.

4. Agreements or contracts are rules made for Concord by the ſelf-governing power that all men have over themſelves: and they are juſt rules when juſtly uſed.

5. Beſides all theſe, moſt make a mans own reaſon, judgment or conſcience, the immediate ſubordinate rule of his actions. Indeed it is more fitly called the diſcerner of his rule and duty, as the eye is to the body: For it maketh not duty, but diſcerneth it made: But if any will call the *Underſtanding a Rule* to the *Will*, inſtead of a *Guide*, we may bear with the impropriety. All this is clear truth.

Now the queſtion is, how any of theſe ſubordinate rules are *juſt* or *falſe*?

1. Two things God hath not only allowed, but commanded them all to do about Religion. 1. To command ſubjects as Gods officers to obey Gods Laws, and in juſt caſes to puniſh the breakers of them, in matters within their juriſdiction. And to do this by Laws, Mandates, Judgment and Execution. 2. To make ſubordinate Mandates or Laws for determining ſuch Circumſtances as God hath commanded them to determine, by the General Law of Governing or Ruling, and of doing all to unity, concord, edification, peace, order, and decency. Theſe things Chriſtian Magiſtrates may do Nationally. Paſtors to their Flocks, Maſters to their Families and Scholars; and

equals

equals (Paſtors and People) may make fit agreements where they are free:

And theſe rules may be called *falſe* or *true*, in ſeveral degrees.

1. It's groſs falſood and uſurpation, to ſet up an office forbidden of God, and falſe in its very nature.

2. It's next in degree falſe, for men of an office of Gods inſtitution, to command things utterly out of their calling and juriſdiction, in which they have no power from God mediately or immediately. Conſcience binds none to formal obedience (*propter authoritatem imperantis*) to either of theſe; tho material obedience, and non-reſiſtance, may be duties.

The lower degree, is when the office is of God, and the matter is in their power, and not only belonging *ad alienum forum*; But they *miſdetermine* it in the manner, not uſurping anothers office, but doing their own amiſs: Tho herein conſcience is not bound to obedience; *gratia materiæ ſub ratione indebiti modi*; yet if the matter be not forbidden of God, obedience may be a duty herein, *ſub ratione medii*, neceſſary to ſeveral ends; that is, *to concord, to honour the governor, to avoid offence, and to avoid greater hurt to the Church, others, or our ſelves.*

But if the thing commanded be forbidden of God, no man muſt do it. But divers things commanded unlawfully in the manner, may become duties by that command, becauſe they be made thereby needful means of Unity, Peace, Honour to Rulers, *&c.* as aforeſaid, which elſe would have been ſin (as to meet at an inconvenient time or place, to uſe a Tranſlation, metre, *&c.* leſs fit.)

Now all theſe being ſubordinate rules, they bind only ſubordinately by virtue of Gods ſupreme rule, who made them rulers (and he is no ruler that can give no rule); even as corporation By-Laws bind only by vertue of the Soveraigns higher Law.

And tho this Author would be the Ruler of Language ſo far, as to ſay that all *ſinful Worſhip is not falſe Worſhip*, they that uſe words, as greater Maſters have long ſtated the ſence, do know, that the falſeneſs is the diſconformity to Gods ſupream Rule, and that may be in all the degrees forementioned: And Rules or Worſhip are both falſe ſo far as they are diſconform to the Law of God.

And now wherein is our Rule, falſe and theirs true? 1. We own no Rule of direct immediate obedience to God, nor of any univerſal or unchangeable duty to God, but what his Law (of Nature, or ſuper-

natural) doth make us. We hold that no man hath power to alter Gods word, to command any thing againſt it, nor any thing which God hath appropriated to himſelf, as to make new conditions of ſalvation, new Sacraments, new Laws, as Gods, or new duties for themſelves, neceſſary to Salvation; no, nor any thing but what Gods own General Law doth command or allow them to determine, being left by him undetermined, to their Power and Rule.

We hold that if any Ruler go contrary to, and beyond thoſe Rules of God, it is their ſin, and not ours, and we openly diſown it: And ſo do our Rulers in general themſelves moſt expreſly in the Books of Articles, Ordination, Homilies, Apology, *&c.* Binding all Miniſters to the Scripture for the Rule of their Preaching and Living, only infallible, ſufficient in all things neceſſary to Salvation; and that if Councils, or any men err or diſagree with Scripture, they are not to be followed.

We openly renounce all falſe Rules, and Canons; but if for ſuch ſin againſt their own profeſſion of Scripture-ſufficiency, we muſt renounce Communion with all that are guilty, we ſcarce know the Church on Earth which we muſt not renounce. And the opponents in Particular.

2. For let us try now whether you have no Rule which you call *Falſe*, as well as falſe or ſinful practice. But I will firſt take in his fuller explication, leſt I miſtake him.

IX. Page 37. *I roundly aſſert againſt you, That tho every Church of Chriſt hath the liberty aad priviledge to act prudentially, or make prudential determinations concerning the preſent uſe of indifferent things* pro hic & nunc, *yet to make any ſtanding or binding determination and Laws for themſelves or other, is altogether unlawful, as highly derogatory to the Kingly office of Chriſt, and robbing themſelves or others of their granted priviledge, and ſo a forfeiture of their Charter: And ſo all your by-ſtanding laws and ſubordinate Laws for worſhip which you talk of, are unwarrantable additions to the word of God.*

Anſ. 1. This indeed is *round aſſreting*; but your word is no proof, and here is no better.

Contraily, 1. Thoſe whom Chriſt maketh Rulers of his Church, and commandeth to do all things, not particularly determined by him, as ſhall conduce to peace, concord, order, decency, and edification, may Rule accordingly by ſuch determinations.

But

But ſome ſuch there are whom Chriſt maketh Rulers of his Church *&c.* ergo, *&c.*

Maj. Prob. Matth. 24. *Who then is a faithful and wiſe Servant, whom the Lord hath made ruler over his houſhold to give them meat in due ſeaſon,* &c.

1 Theſ. 5. 12. *Know them who are among you, and are over you in the Lord,* &c.

1 *Cor.* 4. 12. Let a man ſo account of us, as of the Miniſters of Chriſt, and Stewards of the myſteries of God, *&c.*

Heb. 13. 7, 17. 24. Remember them *who have the Rule over you,* &c. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves, for they watch for your ſouls, as they that muſt give account,* &c. *Salute all that have the rule over you,* &c.

1 Tim. 5. 17. *The Elders that rule well are worthy of double honour.*

1 Cor. 14. 26. *Let all things be done to edifying.* 4. *Let all things be done decently and in order.* 33. *God is not the author of confuſion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the Saints.*

By all this, it is evident that Church Rulers there muſt be; and ſuch ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles in the ordinary parts of their office as Chriſt will be with to the end of the World, *Matth.* 28. 20. And alſo in what their Rule conſiſteth.

Now to the queſtion of *Impoſing*: (I premiſe, that tho this uſurper of a Magiſtry in Language will have *Impoſing* taken ſtill in an ill ſenſe; I leave that to him, it is enough for me to tell him that I take it according to the prime ſignification [*to put a thing on others*] without reſpect to well or ill doing it.)

1. I know not whether by *every Church*, he intend a meer voting body of People and Paſtors by conſent, or the Paſtors alone as the Rulers of a voluntary People.

2. I know not whether he take [*prudential determinations*] as diſtinct from *Governing Obligations*, or not.

3. I know not whether by [*preſent uſe*] he mean it only for *one preſent meeting*, or for more, and for how many and how long: And [*by ſtanding*] how long he meaneth.

I grant to him that no man may make *univerſal* or *unchangeable* Laws, but temporal and mutable, and only for his own ſubjects. But I maintain,

1. That Paſtors may by word or writing make binding commands

or determinations to their Flocks of the foreſaid modes and circumſtances of Religion and Worſhip. For 1. They are ſuch as are neceſſary *in genere*, and the determination to this or that ſort disjunctively neceſſary: Somebody muſt determine them (and that for more than the preſent meeting, even ſtatedly): And it belongs to the Rulers office to do it: None elſe is fit or hath any other power, than by contract.

I have oft enough inſtanced in particulars. It is not meet that every meeting the People be put to Vote where to meet next: And there is no certainty that they will agree; but ſome be for one place, and ſome for another: An ordinary capacious place is neceſſary: It is the Rulers office to appoint it. It's no ſin againſt Chriſt for him to require them to come to the ſame place, from year to year, while it is fit.

2. The ſame I ſay for a commanding determination of the Lecture-days, or times of meeting, which the Paſtor may preſcribe ſtatedly by his office, without the Peoples votes.

Or if all ſuch things were impoſed by a Major Vote on the Minor, their Vote would be a Governing Rule to the Minor part.

3. While Praying with the Hatt on, is by the cuſtom of the country a ſign of unreverence, the Paſtors (or Elders that Rule well) may command the Flocks by their authority, ordinarily, and not at the preſent only, to be uncovered at Prayer and Sacrament in the aſſembly, without wronging Chriſts Power, unleſs obeying it be wronging it.

The ſame I ſay of uſual kneeling at Prayer.

5. If the Congregation be called to confeſs their Faith, or renew their Covenant with God, the Rulers may command all that conſent, to ſignifie it by ſuch a ſign, as ſtanding, or lifting up the hand, or ſubſcribing, *&c.* And they are bound to obey them.

6. I have oft enough inſtanced in Tranſlations, Metres, Tunes, Utenſils, Ornaments, and many ſuch like.

Obj. *The Paſtors make no Laws.* *Anſ.* Dally not with names: Any thing is a Law which ruling authority maketh duty: If Writing it, maketh a Law, they may write it: But a verbal Mandate is one ſpecies of a Law: And impoſeth and determineth, and obligeth to obedience; and it is ſin to diſobey, becauſe God commandeth them to obey, *Heb.* 13. 17. And even by the 5th Commandment.

It

It doth as truly limit, and oblige when Paſtors command, as when Magiſtrates do it, tho they force not by the Sword.

Obj. *But theſe are but natural circumſtances, and belong no more to worſhip, than to any other things.*

Anſ. It's a ſad thought to me to think how many ſeem ſatisfied with ſuch an anſwer as this. All ſubſtances have their accidents, quality, time, place, *&c.* But yet the accident of one ſubſtance is not the accident of another; The quantity and quality of a man is not the quantity and quality of a Toad, *&c.* When theſe accidents are adjoyned to worſhip, they be not accidents of other things. Is *Speaking* no part nor accident of worſhip, becauſe ſpeaking is uſed in common things?

Kneeling is uſed in other caſes: But kneeling in prayer to expreſs reverence, is not common to other things.

Putting off the hat ſheweth Reverence to a Prince: But to be uncovered at Prayer or Sacrament is the Accident at leaſt of that Worſhip, and not of other things: Metre and Tunes belong to Ballads: But the Metre and Tune of Pſalms doth not, but is appropriate to thoſe Pſalms.

Time and Place belong to all natural actions: But the Time and Place ſeparated to Gods Worſhip is an accident only of that.

It is not the natural ſpecification of an act or circumſtance, or the generical nature that we ſpeak of; but the individual accident or circumſtance as appropriate to a religious work.

Is love to God no worſhip, becauſe love is a natural act? Is praying no act of Religion, becauſe we may pray to men? Is eating and drinking no part of the Sacrament, becauſe we uſe them as natural acts for our daily ſuſtenance? Is waſhing no part of Baptiſm, becauſe we waſh at other times: Thinking is a natural act, but holy thinking is more: Were *Davids* ſorts of Muſick no part or accident of Worſhip, becauſe Muſick is natural or artificial?

It magnifieth theſe acts to be applied to worſhip, and it is a commendation of Worſhip-Ordinances that they are ſuited to nature, and advance and ſanctifie it.

Now at laſt I come cloſer to my queſtion: Have you no Church Rulers among you? No Elders that rule well? Is it unlawful to communicate with you, if thoſe Elders by Mandates which are obligatory to the flock do preſcribe Days, and Hours, Temples, or publick places for

for ordinary Worſhip, and if they command you to uſe the new Tranſlation rather than the *Geneva*, publickly, or preſcribe the ſame Metre and Tunes, rather than your Congregation ſhall ſing, ſome one Pſalm, and ſome another: Or if they command them to be uncovered at Sacrament and Prayer, or to kneel at prayer? *&c.* If you take this power from the Paſtors, and will ſeparate from them for ſuch obliging Laws or Mandates, you do that very thing which you fiercely talk againſt; you deſtroy or reſiſt Chriſts Kingly Government by his Officers

Oh what is Man! What are the beſt of Men! What doth the Church and World ſuffer by them! The ſame men that cry up Chriſts Kingdom, call it rebellion againſt him to obey his Officers: As if we muſt depoſe or diſobey the King, unleſs we diſobey all his Judges, Juſtices and Officers.

All the obligatory deciſions that the Apoſtles made about their Love Feaſts, anointing the ſick, the Kiſs of Love, long Hair, covering or uncovering, order of prophecying, and of collections, &c. were not ſtanding Laws to us; nor done by uncommunicable power; but were temporary Laws, and local, and ſuch as their Succeſſors, when fit, may make.

If you have no ſuch Rulers in your Churches, you ſhould queſtion whether your Churches have the true order of Paſtors, as well as you queſtion the Pariſh Miniſters: Do they not want ruling power, as well as theirs; ſpecially if *you* deny the very *power*, and *they* be but hindred in the exerciſe.

Obj. But ſome may be forced to ſay, *Our Paſtors do nothing, but by the peoples conſent.*

Anſ. They are their Paſtors by conſent, and rule them as voluntary, and not by force: But their rule and precepts are never leſs obligatory on Conſcience by vertue of Gods command to obey them: Muſt they preſcribe none of the things forementioned, till all have voted it, or conſented? They muſt command them to conſent, and they ſin if they diſobey, tho they can force none to obey.

Object. But ſome may be driven to ſay, *We allow ſuch preſcribing power to Paſtors, but not to Magiſtrates.*

Anſ. 1. What Power the Kings of *Judah* uſed in Worſhip, *David, Solomon, Aſa, Jehoſaphet, Hezekiah, Joſiah*, I need not tell.

2. Chriſt came not to put down Kings, but to ſanctifie their office: All

All power is given him: By him Kings reign: The Kingdoms of the world are his by right: Rulers are his Miniſters for our good: They muſt puniſh evil doers, and promote well doing: He commands us to honour and obey them; They are keepers of both Tables: They may drive Miniſters to their duty, and puniſh them for mal-adminiſtration: Tho they may uſurp nothing proper to the paſtoral office, nor forbid them any ſuch thing, yet ſuch circumſtances as belong to the nation, or to many Churches, and not to this or that in peculiar, the Magiſtrates may determine: It is of great uſe, that all the approved Churches in a Nation, ſignifie their conſent in the ſame Confeſſion of Faith, the ſame anniverſary days of Humiliation and Thanksgiving (as is done about the Powder Plot) and the ſame Tranſlation of the Scripture, if not alſo the ſame Pſalm Books; God ſtrictly commandeth Concord, and to ſerve him with one mind and mouth, and to avoid confuſion, and diviſion, and diſcord: What reaſon can any man give why Chriſts Officers appointed to rule by the ſword, may not thus diſcharge their truſt? Shall we ſin if the Law impoſe a Tranſlation, PſalmBook, or reverent geſture, unleſs we ſeparate? Is commanded obedience become a ſin? And yet not if a Paſtor or a ruling Majority of people injoin it, or unleſs we leave all to confuſion?

X. Here therefore I utterly renounce the opinion that ſhall hold that ſuch things being lawful when uncommanded, become unlawful when commanded by ſuch as in Miniſtry, Magiſtracy, or Families, or Schools, are Rulers: Yea, if the Ruler miſdo his work, the ſin is his; I muſt not ſeparate from every Kingdom, Church, or Family that is ill governed: Nor am I diſcharged from obedience in *lawful* things by the addition of ſome unlawful commands that deſtroy not acceptable Worſhip, and turn not our food to Poyſon: I tell thoſe Miniſters that publickly charge this on Nonconformiſts, that they muſt not charge any Doctrine of Seekers or Anabaptiſts, or ſuch ſeparatiſts, to be the Nonconformiſts Doctrine: I know not one meer Nonconformiſt of that mind: What we of this Age thought of Epiſcopacy, Liturgy, and Magiſtracy, all that would come in and own that cauſe openly with us, have told the world in our publiſhed Propoſals of 1660 and 1661: To which we refer them that would know their minds.

XI. But when I oft alledged the example of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, this Objector and Anſwerer ſaith, p. 19. *We make not Chriſt and his Apoſtles Hypocrites; for we have proved, that Chriſt never joined with falſe worſhip, ſo much as with his preſence at the place of it, unleſs with this intent, to bear witniſs againſt it; nor did he ever adviſe his diſciples ſo to do:*

do: As for Moſes Chair, it was then Chriſts own Inſtitution, and he had then no other Church or Inſtitution on earth.

Anſ. It was cautelouſly done to paſs by the inſtances of the Apoſtles that neither ſeparated, nor commanded one man to ſeparate from all the faulty Churches, *Rev.* 2. 3. Notwithſtanding the Woman *Jezabels* Doctrine, and that of the *Nicolaitans*, which God hated, and the evil practices; nor from the Church of *Corinth*, where were carnal Schiſms, Defraudings, Lawſuits before Heathens, inceſt unlamented, Sacrament diſorders, even to exceſs of drink, diſorder in Church Worſhip, *&c.* Nor from any other faulty Churches.

Meth'nks they that are ſo ſtrict againſt any additions in Modes of Worſh'p, ſhould not ſo much add or alter Scripture, or accuſe it of defectiveneſs, as to ſuppoſe the Apoſtles to have culpably communicated with ſuch Churches, as *Co'inth*, *Coloſs*, *Epheſus*, *Sardis*, *Laodicea*, *Smyrna*, &c. yea and with the *Jews*, who by falſifying the Rules, called it unlawful to eat with the *Gentiles*, or to eat what *Moſes* Law forbad, and not to keep their days: *Pauls* accompliſhing of his Vow in the Temple, and becoming a *Jew* to the *Jews*, was fully contrary to the opponents Doctrine.

And as to Chriſts practice; we ſaid before you, that he conformed not to any evil, nor ſhould you But did he not ſend the Lepers to a falſe ill-called corrupt ſort of Prieſts, to do by, and with them, what the Law required? Did he not ordinarily joyn in the Synagogues in their worſh.p? Could he have leave conſtantly to teach there, if he had there uſed to cry down their ordinary worſhip? Had the Ceremonious Phariſees no ill forms nor ceremonies in their Worſhip? Again, I ſay, Their long Prayers which were the Cloak of their oppreſſion, were either extemporate, or forms of Liturgy. If extemporate, then the worſt of Hypocrites may conſtantly uſe long extemporate Prayers, and it had been no injury to the Spirit in them, to have perſwaded them to uſe Chriſts form inſtead of them.

If they were Liturgies, then Chriſt did not ſ parate from ſuch; no nor reprove them at all, when he reproveth the hypocritical abuſe of them: Yea, ſeemeth to commend them, while he nameth them, as a Cloak to cover evil, which nothing is fit for, that is not good.

Obj. *He had no other Church?* *Anſ* 1. Then moſt in *England* may go to the Pariſh Churches, where they have no other Church to go to. 2. But Chriſt had twelve Apoſtles, and 70, or 72 other Teachers, and many more Diſciples; Were theſe no Church, nor matter for a Church?

XII.

XII. Obj. Page 4. *God hath not left it in our power to communicate with any ſociety, when they make that the condition of my Communion, which I am convinced of to be ſin to me, that I queſtion whether it be lawful or no,* &c.

Anſ. How oft have I anſwered this, without any reply? 1. If they make your conſent to any ſin, the condition of your Communion, you muſt avoid it: But if they put no ſin on you, to be preſent when they ſin, is a condition to all Church Communion, and to your own praying, who ſin in all your ſelf; you before excepted ſins of ordinary infirmity, as not warranting ſeparation: And when did you ever prove that the compoſing and impoſing of the Liturgy, (much more the Obedient uſe of the Lords-day part) is not a ſin of infirmity, as much as ſlandering it and the Churches, and writing ſuch Books as yours? Accuſing is not proving.

2. If your taking it for ſin be true, you muſt forbear it: If you *miſtake* it for ſin, which is duty, (*per ſe* or *per accidens*) you ſin againſt God, and truth, by your miſtake, and by your Omiſſion. God bindeth you to alter your Judgment; and ſo he doth, if you take an indifferent thing for ſin, tho here it is ſafeſt to forbear. An erring Conſcience is no Lawmaker (leſs then a Magiſtrate), but a miſconceiver, and doth, *ligare non obligare.*

XIII. Obj. *But none of the things are indeed Worſhip, which you ſay men may command?*

Anſ. That man ſhall be none of my guide, that makes queſtions of bare names to *ſeem to the people, as if they were about the matter named.* [They are ſuch accidents of the Worſhip, which God himſelf commandeth, as are done in the outward expreſſion of reverence and honour to God, and the more decent and edifying performance of his own Inſtitutions.] This is the deſcription of them, (Kneeling, being uncovered, ſwearing with outward ſigns, ſinging in Tunes, Metre, *&c*). Agree to the thing, and call theſe *Worſhip* or no *Worſhip*, as you pleaſe. You ſay, *Falſe Worſhip* is no *Worſhip*; If ſo, it is no bad Worſhip; but all faulty Worſhip is not null.

XIV. As for his general talk of me, how much I have promoted Popery, and being for Juſtification by works, and merit, *&c.* I give him leave to eaſe his Stomach without an Anſwer, and all thoſe to be deceived by him that will take his word, and not read mine; eſpecially, my Treatiſe of imputed Righteouſneſs.

Page 9. He ſaith, *When the Scripture ſpeaks of juſtification by faith: Doth any ſound Divine or Coriſtians underſtand it of the act of believing, but that its the object of faith that juſtifieth?*

Anſ. See how ſtrictly theſe men ſtick to Scripture, that will have it the ſole Law of Circumſtances, and yet can deny it, as Expoſitors, at their pleaſure, when *Paul* over and over ſo often ſaith, *That we are juſtified by faith, and faith is imputed for righteouſneſs*; and Chriſt ſaith, *Thy faith hath ſaved thee.* It is not faith that they mean, but Chriſt, *It is faith in Chriſt.* There is no faith, but the act or habit of believing, Rom 3. 21. *The righteouſneſs of God, which is by faith of Jeſus Chriſt, on all that believe.* 25. *Through faith in his blood.* 26. *The juſtifier of him which believeth in Jeſus*: Many ways ſuch will be odiouſly perverted, if you put Chriſt inſtead of Faith; we are juſtified by no meritorious cauſe, but Chriſts righteouſneſs: but that righteouſneſs juſtifieth not Infidels, nor any but qualified Receivers; and Faith is that qualification. Is not this true? And is it not enough? If you would preach or write cenſurious diſputes, whether it be the *Phyſitian*, or the *Medicine*, or the Patients taking it, that cureth him; or the *Meat*, or the *Giver*, or the eating it, that feedeth men, take your courſe: I had rather anſwer that, and moſt of your Books with groans and tears, than with diſputing.

XV. As for his threatning to open my faults as faſt as I diſcover them, I may ſave him the labour, and lament them my ſelf. Two I will confeſs now, beſides all heretofore.

1. I fear I did ſometime by connivence, and by too oft preaching againſt the faults of the Biſhops about 1640, encourage ſome that were ſet upon accuſing and ſeparating, over much. Tho I ever diſliked and oppoſed that Spirit, and foreſaw what Diviſions and Sins attended.

2. Tho, when I took the League and Covenant, it was not impoſed, but offered to Volunteers, (and I never gave it but to one, and kept the Countrie from taking it); yet ſeeing now, what I ſaw not then, I repent that I took it. (Tho being taken, I dare not ſay that it bindeth not as a ſecondary Self-Obligation to that which God bound me to before.)

My reaſons are; 1. Becauſe, as after impoſed, no knowing man can believe that the thouſands of ignorant people that took it, who never underſtood the controverſies of Prelacy, could take it in Truth, Judgment, and Righteouſneſs, and ſo muſt ſin.

2. Becauſe it cut the Nation in two parts, on pretence of Union, and engaged us againſt ſuch excellent Perſons, as *Uſher*, *Davenant*, and againſt the greateſt half of the Land, when we ſhould have united on the terms of the Baptiſmal Covenant.

3. Becauſe, being before by God and our Allegiance ſufficiently obliged to the King, by a further Vow of mans own making againſt his

his will, they entangled the consciences of the people about the meaning and the obligation of it; some thinking it bound them not to him; and other, that it bound them to fight for him, and yet to oppose the Prelacy that he was for. And now the Law for Corporations binds men to declare that there is no obligation at all from that Oath (either for the King, or against any sin).

XVI. 'There are also more than one of my Opponents, who tell me, 'That because I live in prosperity my self, and suffer not, therefore I am 'insensible of the case of sufferers, and add affliction to the afflicted, and 'have not due compassion on them.

Ans. If this be true, it is a great sin. But 1. why do the same men accuse me for perswading men to avoid sufferings, as they think, by ill means? It is indeed to save men from suffering by mistake for that which was their duty, to the injury of others, and to reserve their patience for better uses, being like enough to have need of it all.

2. I thank God I am so far from being insensible of the sufferings of the church of Christ throughout the world, that I may say with *Paul*, *Rom.* 9. 1. I have continual sorrow in my heart for the wars, blood, cruelties exercised on them, and much more for their own sin. And sure all the wrath that is against me for labouring to save this Land from division, self-destroying and suffering, 1661. and since, might have been avoided, had I been so self-saving as the accusers feign me.

3. I thank God my sufferings have been far less than I expected or deserved of God, and not worthy to be called sufferings in comparison of thousands in foreign Lands. And I humbly thank the King that they have been no greater; but if they had, all had been now almost at an end. I am not willing to name them, lest it seem to savour of impatience, but remembring *Pauls* example to such accusers (to the *Corinthians*) I will briefly say, 1. From 1639. to 1660. I suffered more assaults and opposition than some of them, by divers penalties for divers duties against iniquity.

2. I think I was the first silenced since the bishops return. And the hot displeasure against me for my pacificatory labour 1660. and 1661. is not unknown.

3. Enquire whether there be more virulent and voluminous accusations printed against me, or any one of them.

4 I have had no Pastoral maintenance these 23 years, and no Church to maintain me, nor any stipendary Lecture; and for about 15. years I received no gift of money from any, but one man, which I could not without incivility refuse.

5. When I went twice a day to their Church at *Acton*, I was ſent to the common Gaol (accuſed for a Sermon for meekneſs and obedience, and ſubmiſſion to Government) and when I built a Chappel, it coſt me about 20 l. to get a Miniſter out of the priſon (that had formerly been impriſoned for the Kings ſervice) for preaching but one Sermon there, when I was twenty miles off.

6. All that I had, was diſtrained on, and taken from me, all my books, and the very bed I lay on, for preaching after (though, *bona fide*, they had been on juſt conſiderations given, or made over to another, and were not mine, but the preſent uſe of them only reſerved to me) and this by many warrants, as convict by the oaths of I know not whom, nor when, nor could ever know my accuſer or witneſs, nor was ever ſummoned to ſpeak for my ſelf, much leſs to examine the witneſſes.

7. I have been put in city and countrey to remove my habitation about twelve times, and my perſon twenty, in the midſt of my pains, to my great coſt and trouble.

8. How many thouſand pounds my conſcience hath coſt me in the loſs of a biſhoprick (by the Lord Chancellor offered) ſince 1661. beſides all other loſſes and charges, I leave you to compute, and ask you which of you hath loſt more? tho I acknowledg with thankfulneſs to God that I never wanted food or raiment.

9. And while I am now writing for Parochial churches and communion, and know no Law of the land that I break, I am hated; and while I keep my bed in pain, or my couch, there are new aſſaults which I think not fit to publiſh.

10. And all this is but as a flea-biting in compariſon of the ſufferings which I carry about me by continual pain or languor through age and many uncurable diſeaſes: And under the expectations of death, how ſmall a matter is it to me, whether I dye in a Gaol for my duty to God, or in my hired houſe, out of which I have very few times gone theſe two years, but it hath been a priſon to me. What difference but conceit and conſent? If our Rulers think it for the intereſt of any cauſe or party that I dye in priſon, I ſhall acknowledg Gods will in the effect of theirs, and it ſhall not be in their power to make me ſuffer for any thing but my duty to God (beſides faults long ago pardoned, and common humane infirmities). And it is not mens calling duty by the name of the moſt odious ſins, that depriveth Martyrs of their reward with God. The falſe imputation of ſin by men, was not the leaſt part of the ſufferings of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and the Martyrs in all ages.

XVII. And becauſe others as well as I, have need of ſelf admonition, I will tell my Brethren, that our chief work is (the ſame with *Jobs*) to fruſtrate the Tempter, and ſee that *in all this we ſin not, nor charge God fooliſhly*: And he that only triumpheth in ſuffering in conſcience of his innocency, and doth not know that ſuffering hath its proper temptations, and ſtudyeth not wiſely how to eſcape them, will ſuffer more by himſelf than by all his enemies.

I will therefore tell you what are the temptations here which I fear and watch againſt.

1. Leſt the injuries of men ſhould *deſtroy my due charity to them*: Tho its true that the ſetled Study and labour of ſome, for factious or carnal ends, be to deſtroy Chriſtian Love, and ſerious Godlineſs, and the Souls, Bodies, and eſtates of the moſt innocent who they think ſtand in their way, (*and falſehood, hatred and deſtruction* are the Devils work and image) and no man muſt extenuate ſuch crimes, John 8. 41, 42. Yet Diaboliſme is not to be imputed *to all* that men *ſuffer by*; muchleſs to our *Governours, whom we muſt honour: Paul* himſelf perſecuted in ignorance; and Chriſt ſaid, *they know not what they do*? Much leſs muſt we blame others, if truly the cauſe be only in our ſelves.

2. Much more muſt we watch againſt deſires of revenge, or call for fire from Heaven, or imitate any that injure us, by requiting evil with evil, but ſee that we forgive as we would be forgiven. If they be impenitent, and God forgive them not, their ſuffering will be heavy enough.

3. We muſt watch againſt blinding paſſions, that it carry us not into contrary extremes, that we may be far enough from ſin; and ſo leſt we fall into ſin on the other ſide. Too few can keep to the line of truth; moſt reel like drunkards from ſide to ſide.

4. We are much in danger of *biaſſed ſtudy*; never ſtudying *impartially what may be ſaid againſt us*, and *for our oppoſers*, but only all that may be ſaid *for us againſt them*.

5. Men that have a good cauſe are too apt to betray and ſpoil it by *an ill manner* of defending it, by *mixt errors, ill arguments* or *paſſions*, to the hardening of the adverſaries and afflictors.

6. We muſt take heed that we fear not *ſuffering wrong*, more than *doing wrong*. He that *doth the wrong* is a far greater ſufferer or loſer, than he that *is wronged*. Our ſtudy muſt be, that we neither *think, wiſh, ſpeak*, or *do* any wrong to our adverſaries and afflictors.

7. We muſt watch leſt the *great wickedneſs* of any adverſaries ſhould be ſo much in our eye, as to tempt us to make light of our

own

own ſin, becauſe it is not ſo great as theirs.

8. And we muſt watch leſt the conſcience of our *good cauſe* or *innocency to man*, ſhould make us foget our *many ſins againſt God*, for which he may permit men by injury to afflict us.

9. We muſt watch leſt we judge of the *Cauſe* by the *Perſon*, and ſhould take *truth* to be *falſhood*, and *good* to be *evil*, becauſe *bad men* or *adverſaries* own it; or leſt we take *falſhood* to be *truth*, and *evil* to be *good*, becauſe *good men* hold it; and leſt in Love or Pity we *juſtifie the ſin* of any ſufferers.

10 But we muſt ſpecially take heed leſt fleſhly intereſt and love of riches, liberty or life, ſhould bias and blind our judgments, to take any thing to be Lawful which we think is neceſſary to our quietneſs and ſafety, and to uſe ſinful means to avoid danger and ſufferings.

Theſe are my Studies, and I think them neceſſary to all.

And the rather when (it grieveth my heart to ſee, ſo) many carryed by ſuffering ſo far from unity, charity, and moderation, that they even joyn with thoſe whom they ſharpleſt accuſe, (tho by other reaſons) to do their *very work*, and to deſtroy that which they think they are promoting. For inſtance,

1. They blame the Papiſts and ſuch conformiſts for ſaying that the *Miniſters* of the Reformed Churches are *no true Miniſters*: And *they ſay the ſame.*

2. They blame them for ſaying *their Churches are no true Churches. And they ſay the ſame.*

3. They blame them for recuſancy, and ſaying it is unlawful to communicate with them; and *they ſay the ſame.*

4. They blame them that *ſilence Miniſters*, and forbid and hinder them from worſhipping God. And they themſelves diſſwade all the *land from all publick Church-worſhip*, where none but with thoſe that uſe the Liturgy can be had.

5. They juſtly blame *Love-killing reproachful Sermons.* And they write *Love-killing reproachful Books.*

6. They juſtly blame *falſe accuſers of particular perſons*, and they *falſely accuſe almoſt all the Churches on Earth, as no true Churches.*

7. *They are juſtly for mutual forbearance*, and againſt *cruelty*; and they unjuſtly aggravate the faults of almoſt all Church-worſhippers on earth, as ſo odious that it muſt be ſeparated from; and in a ſort excommunicate them

8. They fear Popery is ready to take poſſeſſion of the Land and Church, and they exhort all Proteſtants to forſake all the publick Churches

churches, which are the Garison of the Protestant cause, that so the gates may be set open, and the Adversaries may find the houses ready swept and garnished, or the Garison emptied for their coming.

9. They are against the ejecting of the Ministers 1662. and yet crying down a *Comprehension*, they would not have them restored, unless it were on terms that will take in them also (and who knoweth whom?)

10. Yea, the very top of Popery is to *appropriate all power of church-government and worship to the Clergy*, and to make Magistrates therein but the Clergies Executioners, saying they are only for *civil government*, for the body, but the Pope and Clergy only for *Religious government* of the church, and for the souls. And some called by dividing names among us, say, That Christ only and his Ministers have power in such matters, and that Princes sin if they command but a *Translation*, a *reverent gesture*, a *church ornament*, and such circumstances; and that it's a sin to obey them.

When I see that exasperation by afflicters hath cast some sufferers into such self-contradicting ways, I will set on my heart and judgment a double watch in sufferings and abuse.

And now Reader I again say, That tho I was dragg'd to this sort of work as against my will, I thank God (and my sober sort of Opponents) for calling me to it, that before I dye I might explain my Writings, and not by writing only against one extreme, leave them behind me as snares to tempt men to the other extreme.

And I here leave my testimony again against all malignity that would charge these errors on the innocent for a cloak of hatred, and cruelty, and oppression, that *I know not one meer Nonconformist that holdeth any of these errors*; and *I* verily believe that the *Independents* that *I* am acquainted with, are true servants of Christ; and many called *Anabaptists*, sober, godly Christians; and that some called *Separatists* retain Christian charity, and meerly for fear of sinning, flye too far from others.

And as for all the rest, it is not mens calling them all *Dissenters*, nor their suffering together, that can make the innocent responsible for the faulty, who perhaps do more against their mistakes, than ever such Accusers did (to cure them).

And I must tell the *Abaddons*, that the opposition that hath been raised against them among those that I was acquainted with before 1641, and 1642, was caused chiefly by the badness of those that made it their trade to preach against strict and serious obedience to God, as *Puritanism*, and Hypocrise, and made it the Ladder of their aspiring Ambition

tion to make such odious, and to hunt with jealous severity those that used for mutual help in the ways of Salvation, to pray together (especially if they fasted) or consulted how to obey Gods Law: Just acting over the part of the Bps that *Martin* separated from, described by *Sulpitius Severus*, rendering all suspected of *Priscillianism* that were more than others in reading the Scripture, Fasting and Praying) and clapping on the back with encouragement the Drunkards and prophane ignorant rabble, who in every Town were the haters of the godly Conformists and Nonconformists; and making these the instruments of their malice, and praising them, and the multitude of ignorant, reading Priests, as more worthy Subjects, than men fearing God. *Ri. Hooker* in his Preface describeth these; and he that readeth his *Europæ Speculum*, may know that it was no better Conformists that his most beloved Pupil, Sir *Edwin Sandys* was against, while he was one of the zealous Parliamentarians.

It's true that many were very hot against Bishop *Laud* and the *Arminians*, and against Dr. *Heylin*, and Dr. *Pockington*, for proving *Sunday no Sabbath*, and calling the *Table an Altar*, and the *Ministers*, *Priests*, and the *Sacrament a Sacrifice*.

Blame not men that had read of their principles and practice, how *Rome* is a Leech that must live on blood, and cannot stand without it, if they were afraid of coming thither again, or drawing too near it. Upon my knowledg, the debauchery and malignity of many that hunted them, and would not let them stay at home in peace, and the terror of two hundred thousand murdered in *Ireland*, was it that drove most that ever I knew into the Parliaments Army: And fear doth often drive men to seek for self-defence to that which seemeth next at hand. Had those whom they feared been such as their functions obliged them to be, men of Holiness, Love and Peace, they would have been less prejudiced against the rest; they bore easily with Dr. *Chappel*, Mr. *Mayden*, and some other godly charitable men that were reputed *Arminians*.

I here adjoin it to my confessions. 1. That I thought worse of that called *Arminianism* than I should have done: (and have proved in my Catholick Theology, (not yet writ against by any that I know of) that the difference is not in any great and intolerable error on either side). 2. That the practice of them that prophaned the Lords day, and the malignity of their abettors, made me too much offended at the books that called the *Lords day no Sabbath*, and the *Ministers*, *Priests*, and the *Table*, *an Altar*, and the *Sacrament*, *a Sacrifice*: For

I now

I now know that these allegorical Names were usual with the best of the ancient Churches without contradiction: And that the *Lords Day* is indeed never called *the Sabbath* in the New Testament; and that the word *Sabbath* in the Bible signifieth *a day of ceremonial Rest*, which was a *Jewish Ceremony*; and that all such are by *Paul* said to be put down, and that the *Lords Day* is a day of *holy Assemblies* and rejoicing in spiritual, Evangelical Worship.

Ignorance and *prejudice* in these controversies prevailed, not from *argument*, but from the *experience* of the *quality of* too many that opposed them: They thought it a most improbable thing, that God should illuminate vicious, worldly haters of Godliness, and desert those that most desired to please him.

And of late times, what abundance have been driven from the publick Churches, by those that rail at them when they come there, and would get the Birds into their Net by throwing stones and bawling at them; and would get the fish to take the bait, by beating the Waters.

The Bishop of *Worcesters* silencing me, and preaching as he did, and the imprisonment of many of the people after, affected my old hearers with so much distast of that sort of men, that all the Writings and perswasions I could use, would not reconcile them, nor scarce keep them from falling out with me for my perswasions: And now they have a Worthy, Pious, preaching Bishop, a Man of Love and Peace, and a good Minister, they all crowd the Church, and are like to fall in love with such Bishops.

And I must testifie, that with the generality of the Nonconforming Laity, I never found, but it was *good preaching* and *good living* that won their Love: And they will honour and follow such men, whether Bishops, Conformists, or Nonconformists.

XV. Since the writing of this, I understand that some numerous persons have been afraid to communicate in publick, or joyn with the Liturgy, by hearing that some that have done it, have been so troubled in Conscience, that they have fallen into despair, and a doleful state of trouble.

To this I answer, 1. You shall never prove that I have perswaded any Minister, to give Christs body and blood as a Drench to the unwilling, or to make the Sacrament of Love, the Instrument of Malice or Cruelty, or a snare to strangle Souls. It must be that Offence must come, but wo to them by whom it cometh. The old Church made men

beg for Church-Communion; if any withdraw from it, and excommunicate themſelves, they did not ſend them to Goal for their Converſion, to force them to ſay, that they repent, and to force them to Communion.

2. But I muſt ſay, that theſe Miniſters or people that have ſo ill taught theſe troubled Souls (by Doctrine or Example) as to tempt them to take their Duty (or a lawful thing) for ſo deadly a ſin, are far from being guiltleſs of their Trouble, Diſtraction or Deſtruction. If any ſhould make them believe that it were ſuch a dangerous thing to pray by a Book, to ſing *Davids* Pſalms, to Communicatie with Presbyterians, not to be rebaptized, not to keep the *Saturday* Sabbath, *&c.* And then, when he hath affrighted one to make away himſelf in melancholy deſpair, ſhould uſe this inſtance as an argument to affright away others alſo from their duty; I ſhould think that he were too blame: This were not by *good words and fair ſpeeches*, but by *bad words and deeds*, to deceive the hearts of the ſimple, in cauſing diviſions and offences.

3. I believe I have had with me in my time many ſcores that have had ſuch melancholly terrors, without any ſuch cauſe; and muſt the matter of their trouble therefore be proved faulty? I have known thoſe that for many years could have no peace of mind, while they continued Orthodox and Religious; and at laſt hearing Irreligious Sadduces, turned filthy, and ranters, and were never under trouble more (that could be perceived) but boaſted of their peace. Who knoweth not that Melancholly maketh many of the moſt ſound and blameleſs perſons, like *Spira*, a weary of their lives, thorough deſparation.

4. I can tell theſe Objectors of eminent ancient godly men, that long forbore publick Communion, and at laſt uſed it, and have had more comfort and edification, than ever they had before; and the more for breaking through all the ſharp Cenſures of their former company, in obedience to their Conſciences herein: And when they have ſeen a ſcandalous perſon with them at the Sacrament, have gone with Humility, Love, and Tears, and told him of his ſin and danger, and had ſuch ſucceſs as hath comforted them more than avoiding that Communion ever did: yea, I know thoſe that being threatned by violent Paſtors, that uſe Diſſenters with rigor, have humbly and ſubmiſſively ſo pleaded with them from Scripture and experience, againſt that Spirit and Way, as hath overcome them, and melted them into a more tender and peaceable mind and courſe.

A Poſt-

A Postscript on a Book of Mr. J. Fs.

SINCE the Writing of all foregoing, I have received another Book sent me by J. F. *Whether he will be angry if I expound this* J. Faldo, *I cannot tell; I read it over to see if there were any thing in it that should change my Judgment: But I will not promise to do so by any more such. Nor will I so much as tell the Reader what my Judgment said of it in the reading; much less write down the Answers which readily offered themselves to my understanding as I went on; for it would but more provoke him, I see, and do the Reader little good, unless by helping him to lament the churches case through the infirmities of such as I and he are; And the more patiently to bear all our present sufferings, by considering how unable we are to agree what to chuse for our selves, if we had our wills, and how far we should be from desired concord.*

I will not write a Book to contend on the question, Whether Mr. Faldo *or I be the wiser or better man: I am conscious of so much ignorance and badness, that if it may edifie the Reader, let him think of me as ill, as Mr.* Faldo *and all such men would have him: If he have a good cause, I wish the Reader may be of his mind: If not, I find not my self obliged to talk on against such Writers any further, for his rescue; nor do I think I can say any thing herein, which at his rate Mr.* Faldo *cannot answer.*

I only say, that he and such other have satisfied me, That the Liturgy-*VVorship in the common Lords Day office is comparatively purer than the VVorship of many is like to be, who oppose it. His Counsel is good, to know what the VVorship is before I consent to it: I have tried what is in the* Liturgy; *I concurred with many better men,* 1661 *in telling the VVorld, how far we could approve or use it. I find in it much good, and in the ordinary Lords Day common service, no fault that should alienate me from conjunction with the Church therein.*

To talk of faults in Baptizing, Burial, Marrying, &c. *is to say nothing to this point; I never saw any of these used since I joined with the Church in the Lords-Day VVorship: But how to try Mr.* F. his *VVorship before-hand, I know not He saith, that if we will be at the cost of it, we may have better worship. And tho he seem displeased for being called a consenter to my catholick communion, either he consented that the* Parish-Church-Worship should rather be used than none, *or else (which I suspect) when I have read his Book, I cannot understand so much as what he is for or against; what he meaneth by a* Meeting *of four, whether he take it for a* Church, *I know not: I take it not for a Church, that hath no Minister or Sacrament: And if he know of so many score, or hundred thousand Nonconformable Ministers as may guide all the people*

People in England, as such Churches of four, I do not: And if Communion in the Liturgy be simply unlawful, it is so to all the Land. I think there are millions in the Kings Dominions, that can have no other Church-Worship than with the Liturgy, at what rate soever they would purchase it.

If his conceits of my self contradictions were as true as they are false, I will tell him other reasons of what he counteth unaccountable, than that I wrote one Book in 1659, and another in 1684. I am now 25 years elder than I was then; and its a shame to learn nothing in so many years: I am more above all worldly hopes than he is: I am past all capacity of them. I have less cause of fear than he: They will hardly confine me to a Prison narrower than my Bed and Couch. My glass is almost run: If I be not more apprehensive of my speedy account, and it awe me not to own nothing but the truth; without dawbing with one extream or other, I am much to blame. And I have seen some more of the experience of both extremes (tho alas I saw too much before).

And after all, comparing all together, I leave posterity my thoughts.

1. That I had rather the Church had a Liturgy (to make all foreknow what Worship they meet for) with free prayer also in its place, than to have either alone.

2. If they must be separated when the Minister is of tryed soundness and ability; I had rather have his free prayer alone. But for many others, I had rather have the Liturgy alone.

And for instance, Mr. Faldo hath oft told me, that his Church at Barnet (as I twice said before) not only omitted, but renounced or opposed all singing of Psalms for many years; that many of them were of such ill opinions, that he was put to much work to save them from being Quakers (and at what cost they can now have Church-Meetings when he hath left them, I know not).

For Mr. Faldo to hold up such a Church even to suffering, and to write against Communion with the Liturgy, where there are able godly Ministers, is either erroneous partiality in him, or I am blind in my unwilling ignorance.

To which I further add again, that I cannot expect that men Preach sounder Doctrine than they studiously Write; nor that they pray more soundly than they preach; and if Mr. Faldo, and all such Writers, so pray, and so preach, and so live, (much more if also their Churches have such Maimed Worship as aforesaid, and some of them unordained Ministers, and many Churches men of many contrary doctrines) I take the Common-prayer Book Worship and Communion, to be much purer than theirs. The Lord make our successors wiser, better, and more peaceable than we are.

FINIS